DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 240 RC 004 874

TITLE	Proceedings: Annual Conference of Council of United States Universities for Rural Development in India, and Campus Operations Committee (3rd, Columbus, Ohio, July 19-21, 1970).
INSTITUTION	Council of United States Universities for Rural Development in India, Manhattan, Kans.
PUB DATE	21 Jul 70
NOTE	79p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.05
DESCRIPTORS	Agencies, *Agency Role, Conference Reports, *Developing Nations, Developmental Programs, *Foreign Countries, Interagency Cooperation, *International Programs, *Rural Development, Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*India

ABSTRACT

The Third Annual Conference of United States Universities for Rural Development in India (CUSURDI) was attended by representatives of American and Indian universities cooperating with Indian and American governmental agencies for rural and agricultural development in India. The table of contents lists 21 entries, which include such topics as (1) University Development in Colombia and Ethiopia, (2) New Opportunities for CUSURDI, (3) Comments from the Agency for International Development (AID/Washington and AID/India), (4) The World Food Congress, (5) Appendix of Conference Participants, and (6) Appendix of Overseas Staff of CUPSURDI. (EJ)

ED045240

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROCEEDINGS

Third Annual Conference

COUNCIL OF UNITED STATES UNIVERSITIES FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA

and

CAMPUS OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Columbus, Ohio
July 19-21
1970

Office of the Executive Director
Council of United States
Universities for Rural
Development in India
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas

RC004874

PAST CHAIRMEN OF THE COUNCIL

1964-5 Dr. A. D. Weber, Kansas State University

1965-6 Dr. Lanier, University of Illinois

1966-7 Dr. Lanier, University of Illinois

1967-8 Dr. Elmer Kiehl, University of Missouri

1968-9 Dr. Elmer Kiehl, University of Missouri

1969-70 Dr. Orville Bentley, University of Illinois

CONTENTS

	Page
Films on University Development in Colombia and Ethiopia	1
Welcome to Ohio State University Dean Roy Kottman	2
New Opportunities for CUSURDI Dean Orville Bentley	3
Report from the Field Operations Committee Dr. Mallory Thorpe	13
Comments from AID/W Dr. James Blume	22
Comments from AID/India Mr. O. A. Bauman	25
The 211(d) Program--Accomplishments and Prospects Dr. T. G. Arscott Dr. O. J. Scoville	26
The APP Program Dean Pendergrass Mr. O. A. Bauman Vice President Floyd Smith	29
The World Food Congress Dr. James Blume	31
Report on the Punjab Agriculture University Evaluation Project Dr. William Thompson Dr. T. Scott Sutton	34
How OSU & PAU can use the Evaluation Dean Roy Kottman Dr. Cecil A. Lamb Dr. Mervin Smith	40
How the Evaluation Procedure Can Be Used At Other Institutions Dr. Mallory Thorpe Dean Russell Larson Mr. O. A. Bauman	44
New Types of Programs that Should be Tried Out Dean Orville Bentley Dean Elmer Kiehl Dr. R. R. Renne	46
My Experiences as an Undergraduate at Punjab Agricultural University Mr. Herbert Hadley	49

	Page
The Role of the University in the National Program for International Rural Development Mr. Ervin L. Peterson	51
Report of the Executive Director of CUSURDI Dr. Orlin J. Scoville	55
Minutes of the Council Meeting	56
Minutes of the Campus Operations Committee Meeting	62
Appendix A. Conference Participants	63
Appendix B. Overseas Staff of CUSURDI Institutions	65
Appendix C. R. O. Olson. Technical Assistance for Agricultural Universities--A Re-examination	72

Sunday Evening July 19

FILMS ON UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT

By courtesy of Mr. W.S. Abbott, Coordinator of International Programs, Oklahoma State University, and Mr. Clyde Noyes, Acting Director for International Programs, University of Nebraska, films were shown on the work of Oklahoma State University at the Agricultural University in Ethiopia and of the interuniversity team directed by the University of Nebraska at the agricultural university in Colombia.

The Oklahoma film was an historical review of accomplishments over the life of the project and was planned to be a part of the contractor's terminal report.

The Nebraska film was designed especially as an aid to recruitment and orientation of new advisors.

Both films were made by Signal Hill pictures of Stillwater, Oklahoma. Cost of the Nebraska-Colombia film was about $12,000 including preparation of script and production of the film.

The films elicited much interest. Several people expressed a hope that CUSURDI, or its member institutions, might produce similar material for use in recruitment and to inform the public of the work being done at the Indian agricultural universities.

Monday Morning, July 20

WELCOME TO THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Dr. Roy Kottman Dean, College of
Agriculture and Home Science

Dr. Kottman expressed pleasure that we could meet at Columbus during the centennial year, and that the facilities of the new Center for Tomorrow were available to us. He then gave a visual tour of the university with the use of slides.

The Ohio State University has 35,000 full-time undergraduate students at Columbus. There are an additional 4,000 students at out-lying campuses. About 4,000 students are enrolled for the Masters Degree and another 3,000 in PhD programs.

The main Research and Development Center for the university is ninety miles away at Wooster. In addition to research on 2,000 acres of land, this center has eighty or ninety graduate students in residence. Some of the Wooster staff also have teaching appointments at Columbus. Dean Kottman's comments on the inconveniences associated with the separate location of the Research Center are apposite to the situation at several Indian institutions.

The Extension program in Ohio is organized around ten area centers to serve geographic zones. There are six specialists at each center and three agents in each county. One recently established center concentrates on the problems of Appalachia.

One of the new programs of the Extension Service deals with improvement of nutrition for low-income people. Two hundred and ten non-professional nutrition aides are working with 6,000 families in thirty-four countries to teach improved nutrition.

Dean Kottman gave examples of the contributions of science to agricultural progress, noting that on three million acres in corn, $45 million of new wealth had been created in the last five years. He gave an example of a dairy farm with two men and one hundred cows which supplied enough dairy products for 2,800 people.

The Dean noted that new knowledge generated in Ohio was transferable to India, Brazil and other developing countries, and concluded his presentation with a brief account of OSU work at the Ludhiana, Hissar, and Palampur campuses of PAU and the Udaipur, Bikaner and Jobner locations of the University of Udaipur.

NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR CUSURDI

Orville G. Bentley, Dean, College of Agriculture
University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois
Outgoing Chairman of CUSURDI

Dean Kottman, Director Smith, and your Ohio State colleagues--

The Council of U. S. Universities for Rural Development in India (CUSURDI) is indeed honored to meet on your campus during the Ohio State University's centennial year observations. We hope that, through our presence, we will be paying homage to great traditions at this fine university and that we may join with you in reaffirming the centennial year theme of continued service to the people of Ohio and the nation through the research and education programs of the University.

As we open this annual conference, it is my pleasure to greet my fellow council representatives, members of the campus operations committees, and the field operations committees. I would ask that Dr. D. M. Thorpe, as the official representative from the field operations committee, take greetings back to our colleagues in India and express to them our appreciation for their continued efforts in behalf of CUSURDI member institutions.

THE SCOPE OF CUSURDI

CUSURDI is like the Indian agricultural universities--a maturing institution---but time has not changed our reason for being. The council was created in the belief that such an organization would serve the collective interests of U. S. universities working in partnership with USAID in providing technical support for institution-building programs in India. While the real achievements from the U. S. side are made by the teams from member institutions, I believe we can say with some confidence that CUSURDI has played an important role in reflecting the shared views of the Council members in discussions on program and operational matters with AID/Washington, and the AID mission in Delhi and, when appropriate, in improving communications with ICAR and the Indian agricultural universities.

CUSURDI is a planning and policy group. It can serve variously as a sounding board, a catalyst, and, if need be, a buffer between the parties concerned with the Indian development program. But its strength must grow out of the institutional commitments of its members, and it follows then that the ability of the Council to serve in a central planning role must reflect the combined aspirations of the member institutions. As we meet to plan for the future, it is incumbent on all members of this partnership effort to identify areas in which we are agreed that we should move ahead. It is equally important that we identify and discuss issues where there is no agreement but in which we can take steps toward an acceptable plan of action.

FACTORS INFLUENCING INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

To deal with broad policy issues, CUSURDI must be sensitive to factors influencing the course of action being taken by both our country and by the Government of India in international development programs.

I shall first speak briefly about some of the developments in the United States that will have a bearing upon the future course of action of CUSURDI.

Despite self-analysis and critical review of current foreign assistance programs, the United States is committed to the proposition that it must share its vast resources of science and technology with developing countries. This same conviction is subscribed to by those countries that seek to resolve some of their pressing problems - particularly population management, food and fiber production, and the use of renewable resources as parts of the strategy for building a better social and economic order.

While there is an obvious long-term commitment, there are at the same time conflicting views in Congress and our federal government about how best to utilize the scientific and technological resources of this country to achieve its national goals.

At best the picture is confused.

NEED FOR IMPROVED AGREEMENTS

The universities have correctly pressed US/AID for greater assurance of continuity of AID financial support. And in so doing, the universities have long urged AID to find ways of accommodating their operational procedures. They seek ways of building more flexibility into contracts and grant agreements so that in-depth, on-going research and educational efforts may be made in the international arena as well as support of international overseas commitments.

Conversely, the Congress and Government can rightly expect continued assurance that participating institutions will have a strong commitment to international education and research aimed at bringing the same level of competence in staff and program support as is now provided for other aspects of the institution's programs.

Several in-depth studies have been made of AID programs and other foreign assistance programs conducted through world organizations, philanthropic foundations, and the world and regional banks. The recent joint report from the Committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and the Agency for International Development merits our careful attention, as it contains many encouraging and innovative

procedural recommendations that would facilitate joint working relationships between AID and the U. S. universities. (For short, it will probably be referred to as the Taggert-Bernstein report, since Joel Bernstein, Assistant Administrator for Technical Assistance, A.I.D. and Glen L. Taggert, President, Utah State University, were co-chairmen of the study committee.)

The report calls for "A New Operational Framework for A.I.D. and the Universities" in its proposal of "The Institutional Development Agreement." It outlines a number of opportunities to improve the collaboration between AID and the universities, both on overseas projects and on supporting domestic activities.

This "Institutional Development Agreement" report outlines a number of opportunities to improve the collaboration between AID and the universities both on overseas projects and on supporting domestic activities. It is appropriate, then, that AID and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) institutions explore in an experimental way various mechanisms for developing a stronger mutual program on a collaborative basis.

The universities have correctly pressed AID for greater assurance of continuity of AID financial support. Conversely, the Agency and our administration can rightly expect continued assurance that participating institutions will have a strong commitment to international education and research aimed at bringing the same level of competence in staff and program support as is now provided for other apsects of the institutions' programs. Institutional grants, support of research projects, and the use of an institutional development agreement for funding overseas programs are examples of the types of activities that the Agency and the universities are now considering jointly.

The recommendations of the Taggart-Bernstein report appear to be overshadowed by a subsequent report prepared by the President's Task Force on International Development, published under the title "The U. S. Foreign Assistance in the 1970s: A New Approach," referred to as the Peterson report. The Peterson task force again sets down a new set of guidelines that could be followed by the United States for funneling its technical and financial resources into international development. Some of the ideas in the Peterson report, as well as those in the Taggart-Bernstein Report, are being adopted by AID. But full implementation of the recommendations in both reports must await some decisions to be made in the Executive Branch of the Government and the adoption or further modification by the Unites States Congress.

In passing, it seems appropriate to comment that while critical self-examination is necessary for avoiding what John Gardner has called institutional dry rot, it is unfortunate that AID and its predecessor agencies have been the beneficiaries of so many recommendations from experts and

quasi-experts on how to administer technical assistance programs. Many of the study reports have overshadowed the central commitment made by this nation that it will seek ways and means for an effective and efficient system for conveying science and technology to less-developed countries for the specific purpose of helping them build their economic and social well-being.

The allocation of financial resources and the implication of development assistance as it relates to our government's international policies are basic issues fundamental to setting the broad directions for our international development assistance commitments. An even more critical issue is how should our government move to mobilize the manpower and scientific talent necessary to carry out U. S. technical assistance commitments, however they are conveyed or administered.

There is a responsibility, too, on the part of the federal government to sponsor programs that will build the manpower and talent pools at universities. This means that the domestic training program should receive more attention if we are to be assured that there will be the kind of manpower and talent needed to meet the problems that lie ahead.

There is also the matter of developing procedures and techniques that will encourage the orderly flow of people into overseas commitments and that will facilitate a feedback of information from overseas experience into the university education and research mix. It is encouraging to note that AID, through the development of its Technical Assistance Bureau (TAB), is working with other divisions within AID to analyze needs and to seek ways in which TAB can facilitate working relationships with universities.

It is appropriate here to note that universities must not underestimate the importance of their role in meeting the U. S. commitment. New commitments will place new requirements on universities, and it is encouraging to note the number of universities that are putting into motion various programs that will accommodate their international education dimensions.

INDIAN INFLUENCE

Having spoken about some of the domestic developments that are likely to influence the Council in its planning in the years ahead, we can turn to some considerations that are emerging on the India scene.

It is obvious that the change of structure and the status of maturity of the Indian agricultural universities will have an important bearing on our future programs. India can be proud of the progress that its agricultural universities have made in a relatively short time.

Given time, experience, academic autonomy, and the all-important financial resources, there is every indication that most of the Indian

agricultural universites will make good progress in the decade ahead. Initially the Indian agricultural universities were primarily concerned with building basic staff and administrative organizations and the physical plant required to start a college or to initiate a research program. But in the future, shifts in instructional inputs and growth are likely to be influenced more by subtle qualities of staff dedication, quality of education, and academic leadership.

Sustained growth of leadership requires an in-depth commitment, and it is incumbent upon those working in an advisory or consultative capacity to emphasize the inherent merits of quality leadership, quality education, and staff quality in relation to instructional growth. The impact of faculty quality and leadership on the "maturity status" of the agricultural universities is obvious, and this factor should have an important bearing on the type of technical assistance sought by Indian institutions from their American counterparts.

We are well aware of the questions being raised, and appropriately so, by GOI, the American government, and the Indian agricultural universities as to phasing-down or phasing-out of technical assistance programs. Many of us recall recommendations in the 1967-GOI - USAID study suggesting that U. S. technical assistance programs in India could be phased down. While planning directed toward phase-out of overseas programs is necessary, precipitous action should be avoided and the decision should be reached only after a thorough study is made of the impact of the phase-out on continued growth and development of the overseas institution involved.

At last year's joint meeting of executive visitors, the vice chancellors of the Indian agricultural universities, and representative from ICAR and the Ministries of Agriculture, the need for planning was underscored. Most of the concern centered around coordinated phase-out with instructional development plans and the potential impact of withdrawing technical support on the continued growth and vitality of teaching and research programs in their early developmental stage. Premature cut-off of technical assistance may reduce future payoffs in terms of program output. At this same meeting there was a clear expression from the Indian agricultural universities for continued technical assistance programs with counterpart universities, but with the nature of the assistance changing in contrast with the kind they needed during the start-up years.

The effect of selective technical assistance requests on planning for Council member institutions is obvious. There must be greater communication and better understanding of the long-range staff needs of the Indian agricultural universities by our institutions if we are to do an effective job in planning our future.

The implications for helping the Indian universities build quality programs at all levels, but especially for post-graduate studies, are also important.

As the Indian agricultural universities begin to flex their academic muscles, they will increasingly be faced with redefinition of institutional

purpose and the relationships of their programs to institutional doctrine. Institutional doctrine is an elusive subject and perhaps esoteric to development needs of an institution. However, there is need to give attention to the matter of a sense-of-being and doctrine for the Indian agricultural university. It is important to us as advisers and as counselors to focus attention on this aspect of institution building.

It is appropriate to recall that the U. S. land-grant universities were given a legislative mandate to serve a high purpose of broadening the educational franchise to include the sons and daughters of the farm and working classes in America. In the early development of our institutions, the concept of education for all those who were qualified and who desired higher education was argued vigorously, and the establishment of this concept for education figured importantly in decisions on financial support and the allocation of scarce educational dollars. It was in the same context that the concept of organized research in agriculture and home economics and in other "useful" areas was incorporated into the concept of the land-grant university. This was followed by the initiation of a system for extension education, specifically designed to deliver knowledge gained through research and education to more people, with particular emphasis on the rural sector.

We can justifiably ask ourselves whether the Indian agricultural universities have developed a uniquely Indian doctrine that will serve as guidelines to program orientation in the years ahead:

Will their educational stance attract and educate more students from rural areas, knowing that these students have not had as good an elementary and secondary school background as students in urban areas?

Will the orientation of research and extension work stress programs that will deliver knowledge to the more backward, small landowners?

Or will the quest for support cause them to gravitate their programs toward the larger landholders where the likelihood of success may be to increased institutional and personal recognition?

Will the doctrine be to develop programs that will increase the personal income of all people, especially those people living in rural areas and who make up some 60-70% of the Indian population?

Will the Indian agricultural universities seek internal linkages that will enhance their capability to carry out more effective research programs through such ties as with ICAR's all-India research schemes, with IARI projects involving other agricultural universities that have state and extension programs, and with internationally established research centers? Will they continue to build viable ties with American universities?

The newly reactiviated Association of Indian Agricultural Universities at its Ludhiana meeting in February heard an address from its president, Dr. M. S. Randhawa, in which he stressed the essentiality of linkages in the development of universities by saying that if the concept of agricultural

universities is clearly understood and accepted, educational institutions would benefit from active participation in the overall development of their state and region. The university-development program linkages should be more involved in financial support, collaboration on projects of research and extension, or through a reciprocal advisory role for the improvement of the programs of the state departments and the universities.

In addition to the types of linkages I have already cited, Dr. Randhawa pinpointed others - namely, the agri-industries of India; international collaboration through AID and the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations; and technical assistance programs of countries other than the United States.

At a convocation address at the Punjab Agricultural University, Dr. J. S. Patel, former vice chancellor at JNKVV, spoke of the rationale for Indian agricultural universities when he said "The essential task of the university is to improve human material through better education--the effect of which will show up markedly after a generation."

THE IMPORTANCE OF PLANNING

We have referred repeatedly to the importance of planning, assuming as I have in this discussion that the Indian agricultural universities will continue to seek technical assistance and academic backstopping in the years ahead. All parties concerned in the network that includes the GOI, Indian agricultural universities, USAID and American universities, must direct their attention toward long-range institutional development plans. This makes it incumbent on all of us to seek ways that will facilitate participation in the planning process as well as the communication of ideas within a workable timetable.

Program planning is an important aspect of pre-budget recommendations and allocation of resources, both by the Indian agricultural universities and their American counterparts. The Taggart-Bernstein report refers to interesting concepts of building linkages through an international research network and the development of new techniques for implementing these linkages to the end that it will strengthen the international development process.

There is another program dimension that should not be overlooked. It is a matter of concentrating on problems of high priority and need in India. To illustrate this concept I refer to two specific programs: One might be the expansion of research and education in water management and technology. Another might be the programs designed to build competencies in plant protection, in agricultural economics and farm management, or in cereal breeding. It would be my impression that such packaged programs will grow in importance as they will serve to enrich the activities of the Indian agricultural universities. Furthermore, these package programs will fit in with the national planning objectives for IARI and the ICAR-all-India schemes. They are also attractive to the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations as they attempt to pinpoint the allocation

of resources to meet specific problems identified jointly by GOI and representatives from international agencies supported through bi-lateral or multi-lateral agreements.

THE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH

It is my prognosis that international development programs of the future will place greater emphasis on the research input as the mechanism for broadening the base for modernizing agriculture and food production. Such a development has an immediate implication for research and extension programs, as well as in the teaching efforts of Indian agricultural universities. Historically we know that American colleges of agriculture learned that teaching in the classroom, as well as through its extension education programs for farmers and cultivators, had to be built from a research base.

Building a research base requires a two-pronged attack insofar as the council members involved in the India program are concerned. First there is a need to build a knowledge base at the American universities. We are fortunate to have made a start through the 211d program, coordinated through the efforts of the CUSURDI staff. But we need to create more opportunities for thesis research and for joint faculty research efforts that involve staff members from American institutions working directly with Indian agricultural scientists.

I have already mentioned the importance of building the institutional esprit de corps and strengthening the self-evaluation and the collective self-image that a university staff holds for itself. One of the important avenues for building individual recognition of staff members is through greater involvement of Indian scientists in international professional organizations. There is a need for scientists of Indian universities to meet with peer groups on a world-wide basis and, hence, I believe it is important to find ways for facilitating exchange of staff members. Perhaps the dream that Frank Parker and Scott Sutton have for creating a foundation that would collect funds to support the ancillary activities of international development could serve an important and significant role in facilitating the exchange of scholars on a professional basis.

211d projects are designed primarily to help build the competencies of American universities to participate in international development programs. In the process we will involve some American graduate students and, hopefully, they will become the skilled practitioners for future staffing of various international development projects. But the current 211d effort is too small and does not meet the needs of the American universities. It is hoped that the new developments within AID will lead to further support of the 211d <u>type</u> as a means of helping American universities prepare to aid the U. S. government in meeting its international technical assistance commitments. On the Indian side, the motivation to develop research will rest heavily with GOI policies as reflected through ICAR and IARI. But there are steps that the cooperating American universities could take that

might be conducive in involving Indian scientists to joint Indo-American research efforts.

Since planning is an important pre-condition to initiating joint research projects, it would appear that CUSURDI might serve a useful role in seeking out opportunities for developing research projects. These projects may be commodity oriented, as in the case of rice or water management or cereal crop breeding, or they may be in the broader, more socially oriented areas. But, nonetheless, the opportunities for developing research schemes involving joint American-Indian agricultural university ventures would be appropriate. If it is the consensus of the Council members, perhaps there ought to be greater emphasis on this avenue for growth and broadening the institutional programs.

There has been no dearth of planning, but there have been slippages in communicating the various ideas in a useable form to the partners involved in this educational effort. No one questions the importance of GOI discussions concerning institutional goals and prerogatives for the Indian agricultural universities however, it is important that the decisions reached by whatever means used within GOI should be known to the AID Mission/Delhi and to the cooperative American universities. Likewise, there need to be some improvements made in the communications from the American universities concerning their aspirations and hopes for program development.

We are building from a strong base, as there has been much effective planning heretofore, but there is a need to rededicate our efforts to building a more effective planning mechanism for all parties concerned. It is especially important that these ideas be reflected into a planning timetable that will serve the needs of the people involved. CUSURDI is dedicated to developing a more effective long-range technical assistance program beneficial to all parties involved.

SUMMARY

In summing up, I endorse the challenge expressed by Mr. Leonard J. Saccio, Mission Director of USAID/Delhi, in his speech before the Association of Indian agricultural universities at Ludhiana last February:

"Drawing on this experience we would now wish to explore new approaches and arrangements for assisting in the development of agricultural education and research institutions. We believe that particularly some of the more advanced of these universities could best be served through a more direct relationship with the American universities. We think that for some of these agricultural universities the time is now right for a less formal and rigid pattern of long-term specialist assistance and participant training to one involving professor exchanges and mutual arrangements between the institutions for advanced degree training.

We will be exploring with your association and GOI ways of improving our arrangements with the American universities for implementation

of assistance programs. We believe that they can do a better job if they are given an opportunity to plan and staff on a longer term basis and given more flexibility and responsibility in implementation of programs. This will, or course, require better planning initially and thorough annual reviews but eliminate much of the day-to-day detailed administration."

Perhaps I am an optimist for international programs, but I feel that we can look forward with some confidence to an increase in AID/university working arrangements based, we hope, on more flexible instruments for conveying support and developing program plans. Staff members in AID are exploring possibilities for developing such instruments, a least on an experimental basis.

But change must be made on a two-way basis. The universities and we as council members must be prepared to modify some of our operational procedures in the interest of reaching an accommodation that will best serve our institutional needs as well as the national purpose in providing technical assistance to less developed countries.

We have a great deal of pride and interest in the continued development of the Indian agricultural universities, and I am sure that I speak for the council in saying that we look forward to a continued working relationship with the Indian universities and the staff members that we have learned to know and respect for their dedication to education and research.

We, like the Indian agricultural universities, can serve a unique role. We can provide continuity, we can train people, we can explore and evaluate ideas. But above all we must be functional institutions giving our energies to the solutions of people-oriented problems.

Let us then jointly look in the years ahead for the opportunities to further institutional goals, both at home and overseas. Let us hope that through education and training of scientific manpower, our efforts will have worldwide implications for the benefit of people.

REPORT FROM THE FIELD OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Dr. D.M. Thorpe, FOC Chairman and
Chief of Party
University of Tennessee/MUAS
Bangalore

Introduction

Dean Bentley, Dr. Scoville and, Gentlemen:

I appreciate this opportunity to represent the Field Operations Committee at this important conference. It is important because of the impact of decisions already taken and those in prospect that affect the future of the AUD and APP programs. Each of your Chiefs of Party, Team Leaders and many other team members have asked me to convey their greetings to you.

The conference agenda places emphasis on continuing contractual program development and the development of new working arrangements with the Indian Agricultural Universities and State Departments of Agriculture. Current situations in India and the U.S. call for critical review of past program accomplishments, appraisal of current programs and the environment within which they operate, and a realistic projection of future programs. During the past year there has been much concern and discussion of these points by the Field Operations Committee. A brief report of the FOC meetings will point up the main areas of concern.

The membership of the FOC committee was increased by including the APP Team Leaders and/or Chiefs of Party as associate members in keeping with the Council's policy statement. Since the July, 1969 report to this group, Dr. George Gist (Ohio), the then Chairman of FOC, has returned to his home campus. Dr. R.B. Dickerson (Pa.) and Dr. Draytford Richardson (Kansas) completed their tours of duty in India and were ably replaced by Drs. R.E. Swope and V.C. Larson the newest member of the FOC, Drs. R.R. Renne and M.B. Russell (Illinois) replaced Drs. E.F. Olver and A.E. Thompson who returned to Illinois shortly prior to this report period. The five members who left India during the past year made significant contribution to the development of their host universities. The new members are contributing importantly in FOC deliberations.

Field Operations Committee Meetings

The Committee met six times during the year. A brief summary of the meetings will indicate the most significant activities and problems considered.

One of the recurring topics has been consideration of plans for conducting orientation seminars for the Boards of Regents. This would require

follow-up on the Council's concurrence on this proposal and concurrence by ICAR. Apparently, ICAR support for such seminars on an Indian-wide basis is uncertain. However, there appears to be no reason why two or more universities cannot combine their efforts in holding such seminars.

Procedures in developing a two-year operational work plan were developed in response to GOI approval of one-year appointments instead of the customary two-years for the stated reason that two-year operational work plans were required for two-year appointments of advisors. The contract teams and Indian University officials prepared and submitted two-year working papers on which the OWP would be based. However, only a one year OWP was signed by AID and GOI.

Although all appointments in AUD have been approved for two years and a few in APP since 1969, it appears that GOI has returned to a policy of one year appointments in APP. It is suggested that the Council and its member Universities adopt a policy of filling advisory position for a minimum of two years.

The proposed UNDP project for development of centers of excellence in five Indian Universities two of which would be in Agricultural Universities was explained and discussed.

Various evaluation projects were explained and plans for collaboration were made. These included the Sloan-Davis APP evaluation, the evaluation of the Punjab Agricultural University, and the inclusion of program evaluation by the audit team. Additional evaluations and reports included the contract authorized semi-annual and annual report, Project Appraisal Report, Contract Performance Report, Semi-Annual Progress Report on Contract Rupee Supported Demonstration Projects, and Management Evaluation by AID/Washington representatives. Also explained and discussed at length is a monthly Accrual Report to be added on all rupee expenditures. The PIP, PROAG and other documents are also required. There is a definite impression in FOC that too much time is required for planning, evaluation, reporting and other paper work to the detriment of program implementations.

Various aspects of the 211(d) program were discussed, including the role of Chiefs of Party and other AUD contract staff. We were again informed that the 211(d) program had not been requested by the Government of India and that servicing of the program was not included in the AUD contract.

The FOC acted favorably on the proposal that increased use be made of consultants who could work with two or more Indian Universities and the associated contract teams. Professor H.J. Miller, Consultant in Campus Development, is currently rendering substantial assistance to five universities under this arrangement. The FOC also agreed to the proposal that exchange of advisors between contract teams for service on special committees and seminars for short periods of time would be acceptable by prior arrangement between the involved Chiefs of Party.

The difficulties resulting from GOI delay in processing nominations for participant training were discussed at length during several FOC

meetings. Nominations for September enrollment in 1969 were not cleared by GOI until August 1969. Several U. S. universities could not enroll the Indian graduate students with only one months notice prior to the beginning of the school year in September. In an attempt to prevent repetition of late clearance the FOC agreed to participate with AID, ICAR and the Indian universities in processing nominations two or three months earlier than heretofore. A resolution was also submitted to the Council requesting approval of the requirement that GOI clearance must be received not less than six months prior to admission to the U. S. institution. For September admission to graduate programs such clearance must therefore be received not later than March 1." This resolution was adopted by the Council for application after 1970. As of this date GOI clearance of the 1970 nominations has not been received.

Several discussions were held in response to both U. S. and Indian concern over speeding up Indian university development to a stage of maturity such that U. S. advisory assistance can diminish or be discontinued in the older universities.

The evaluation conducted at the Punjab Agricultural University by Thompson, Sutton, Gautam and Patel was explained and discussed as to its application in other universities.

Possibilities for continuing relationships between the Indian and U. S. universities after phase out under the present contractual programs was discussed during a number of FOC meetings.

AID representatives expressed interest in involving the FOC as an advisory board in planning new approaches in AUD and APP.

The Long Range Agricultural Adjustment Projection Study and its application at the state level under joint effort by Indian university, staff members and contract team members was discussed in several meetings. Subsequently, two special meetings attended by Chiefs of Party and staff members of the Agricultural Economics Departments of the Indian universities were held to develop methodology and plan action on this study.

Plans were developed for the joint meeting of Executive Visitors and Vice Chancellors, the budget meetings, the meeting of the Association of Indian Agricultural Universities and others.

Delay in approval of rupee demonstration projects under the Trust Fund arrangement and recent restrictions imposed by GOI were matters of considerable concern to FOC because they will eliminate many of the most productive types of projects.

The most disruptive restrictions are:

a. "More than one project per long term specialist per university during the period of the expert's stay would not be permissible."[1]

---

1. Operational Work Plan for period July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971, p. 10.

b. The elimination of authority to employ local staff such as technical assistants, extension guides, and non-professional employees.

c. The movement to designate Indian university staff members as the supervisors and coordinators of the projects which were originally designed to introduce a program or activity not previously conducted by the university.

The need for contract and program adjustments which will permit educational and action programs concerned with second generation problems is a matter of increasing concern to FOC. For example, when new crops such as maize and wheat in southern India, soybeans in other areas or high yielding varieties of traditional crops are introduced, increased attention needs to be given to storage, transportation, processing for human use and animal feed and for non-food products. Many of these activities would require teams of specialists from the contract staff members or backstopping with specialist's assistance from AID.

The FOC and individual members continued to be concerned with the long-standing problems of inadequate housing allowances for contract team members, obtaining safe and reliable vehicles for official travel, delays in clearance of contract staff positions and nominations, and increasing clerical work chiefly concerned with the numerous housekeeping activities for which AID/Delhi approval is required prior to action.

As briefly indicated above there have been some negative and some positive actions during the past year that affect the future development of the AUD and APP programs. Some of these need more detailed explanation.

Recent Developments Affecting AUD and APP Program

Positive Aspects:

A. The Association of Indian Agricultural Universities was reactivated and reorganized in 1969-70 after several years of inactivity. The annual conference was held at the Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana during February 23-26, 1970.

An outstanding slate of officers composed of Dr. M.S. Randhawa, President, Dr. K.C. Naik, Vice President, and Dr. S.R. Barooah, Secretary & Treasurer, were elected. These eminent leaders in education have shown a determined effort to develop a permanent and aggressive organization with following objectives as stated in the constitution:

> "The object of this Association shall be to institute such programs and activities as may more fully effectuate by constant improvement the manifold activities in the fields of resident teaching, research, and extension, such as have been and may be assigned by the Center Government and the State laws as the appropriate functions of the Indian Agricultural Universities. The object may be accomplished:

1. By cooperation and united efforts among and by the member institutions.

2. By the maintenance of proper and legal relationships between the member institutions and the Central government as well as with their respective State governments and other organizations, groups, and agencies supported by the public and private funds.

3. By appropriate action on proposed or actual national legislation affecting the purposes and effectuality of the several Indian Agricultural Universities."

The next conference will be held at U.P. Agricultural University, Pantnagar, on February 25-28, 1971. It is anticipated that the Executive Visitors Conference will be held just prior to the conference so that they can attend and participate in it. Counsel and guidance based on the U.S. Land-Grant College Association experience will be helpful.

B. Several vice chancellors have expressed interest in holding orientation seminars for Boards of Regents especially for those associated with new universities or when new boards are appointed in the established universities. A number of such boards will be appointed during the next few months. If some executive visitors, including a member of a U.S. University Board of Regents and a University officer or two concerned with budgets and staffing, and who have had contacts with the U.S. Boards of Regents, could extend their stay in India for a week or so, orientation seminars with Indian Boards of Regents could be arranged.

C. A proposal to establish a substantial endowment fund from U.S. rupees has been developed. The proposal is being drafted by AID/Delhi and appropriate Indian officials. The interest from the endowment fund would be used by the Indian universities for development purposes.

D. A survey conducted in September 1969 revealed that all of the Agricultural universities are conducting some type of Agricultural Extension program. There is a wide variation in approaches among the universities and hence considerable diversity in recent significant developments. This is to be expected in a new program in the recently established universities. Each is searching for an acceptable and workable program taking into consideration the social, economic and governmental environment within which it functions.

Some universities reported establishment of comprehensive extension programs including Agriculture (crops), Animal Husbandry, Youth Programs, and Home Economics while others are concentrating on Agricultural (crops) programs.

The annual conference of Association of Agricultural Universities and exchange visits among extension workers in the several universities provide opportunities for study and adoption of pre-tested and proven methods. Such interaction is taking place and is encouraged by university officials.

E. Significant progress has been made in teaching and research. A number of universities have adopted substantial training programs in practical farming for students ranging from management and cultivation of assigned plots of land during undergraduate enrollment to a year of practical training after graduation on one of the research stations. In such programs, the student is assigned five or six acres of land some of which is irrigated and some rain fed, and also a livestock project. The student will receive the profit to be used in starting a self-employment enterprise.

There has been a moderate increase in the number of departments offering M.S. and Ph.D. programs and in new colleges such as the Basic Sciences and Fisheries colleges at the University of Agricultural Sciences, Mysore. Departments in three Universities (Punjab, U.P. and MUAS) have been approved for Ph.D. instruction under the Joint Participant Training Program. Proposals for the development of centers of excellence in individual Indian universities have been discussed and accepted in principle. Beginning steps have been taken in this direction.

F. In an attempt to inform and obtain approval of policy making entities for needed technical assistance, five year development plans requesting and justifying needs for such assistance are being prepared.

G. In response to recommendations of the Education Commission, proposals for the establishment of Agricultural Polytechnics similar to vocational education in agriculture in the U. S. are under consideration. Training of teachers, supervision of teachers and maintenance of standards of instruction would be functions of the agricultural universities.

Negative Developments:

A. Reduction of advisory and consultants services under university contract support.

Presumably based upon piecemeal evaluation and unwarranted assumptions as to the attained stage of maturity of seven of the older agricultural universities, the 1970-71 all-India Operational Work Plan calls for elimination of advisory assistance when the tours of duty of the present advisors end.

The idea that seven of the agricultural universities can dispense with advisory assistance was first expressed in official documents in the 1967 Joint Indo-American Report based on a questionnaire and two to three day visit to each university by two representatives from AID/Delhi and two from GOI.

In the 1969-1970 Operational Work Plan signed by AID and GOI, the number of long term advisors was reduced by one or two in each university and the number of consultants requested by the agricultural universities by about 50 percent.

These reductions beginning in 1969-70 were made at the Central Government level. One would get an entirely opposite estimate of the needs

for advisory assistance at the agricultural universities where the assistance is received. For example, the working paper for the Operational Work Plan submitted for F.Y. 1970-71 by Mysore University of Agricultural Sciences requested seven advisory positions and five consultant positions. In the Operational Work Plan signed by GOI and AID no new positions were approved and present positions would be phased out when the assignment of present advisors expire. The number of consultants was reduced to three despite the fact that this University is only five years old, has received advisory assistance in only the three existing colleges, and has three new colleges under construction and plans developed for three more. No advisory assistance except for campus planning will be provided for these six additional colleges if the present Operational Work Plan is adhered to. A similar situation prevails in the other six agricultural universities ranging in age from six to ten years.

The Mysore University of Agricultural Sciences has submitted proforma for the number of advisory and consultant positions originally requested in an effort to obtain reconsideration by GOI and AID.

Dr. K.C. Naik whose book on the history of Indian agricultural universities was recently published has stated:

> "Even among the existing agricultural universities a few (I include IARI in this) have done exceedingly well and a few others are perhaps indistinguishable from the institutions which they have replaced. Since the State Governments have not yet transferred research functions to a good many agricultural universities, and since the extension education is yet a function of several State Departments and partly in some States of Agricultural Universities also, real and tangible progress through the agricultural universities has to wait till all these become full-blooded institutions with the integrated triple functions of teaching, research and extension education."

Thus, there is a wide discrepancy in viewpoints concerning the needs for advisory assistance as between the GOI and the agricultural universities. A number of the vice chancellors have requested in-depth studies by a high level Indo-American team or a study similar to the one recently conducted at the Punjab Agricultural University so that program decisions can be based on reality. Piecemeal evaluations such as mentioned earlier can result in misleading information and conclusions which lead to inopportune and damaging action by decision-making agencies.

B. The increase in clerical work previously mentioned takes advisors staff time that could be more productively used in program implementation. A recent count showed a total of some sixty items, mostly on housekeeping functions, on which written approval from AID must be obtained before action can be taken. Many of these could be eliminated when the University/USAID contracts are renewed.

C. The inclusion of program evaluation by auditors in the audit review and report is questionable as to appropriateness due to consideration of

only selected aspects of the total program. Such piecemeal evaluation is questionable as a basis for proposed remedial action on program operations.

D. The present GOI policy of limiting assignments of all advisors to four years rather than analysis of specific situations regarding needs for continuing assistance or contrary to requests for such continuing assistance by the universities resluts in premature withdrawal of advisory assistance in some instances.

Additional Considerations:

A. Under the present arrangement there is no formal provision for direct communication between the GOI and the U. S. universities. It would seem desirable for the U. S. universities to be represented when decisions are being made on policies and procedures that determine staffing, programs, and other activities to be conducted by the U. S. contracting universities.

Under present procedures the all-India Operational Work Plan signed by AID/Delhi and GOI is developed as follows:

1. In the AUD program working papers setting forth needs for advisory assistance, participant training, demonstration and teaching projects funded from trust-fund rupees, and the plan of work for the next two years are prepared jointly by the Indian university and the contract teams.

2. The working papers are submitted to AID/Delhi by the contract Chief of Party and to ICAR by the university.

3. An all-India Operational Work Plan presumably based on the working papers is jointly formulated by AID and GOI and signed by those two entities. The 1970-71 OWP was not signed until just a few days before the budget conferences. The U. S. university representatives were not informed until the budget conferences that GOI and AID had agreed upon reductions in contract staffing positions, new restrictions on the use of trust-fund rupees, and other changes in programs to be conducted by the universities. The Indian universities were informed later.

The all-India Operational Work Plan reflected little consideration of what was included in the working papers.

A revival of the procedures followed in developing the 1969-70 working papers and Operational Work Plans would provide opportunity for more adequate involvement of the Indian and U. S. universities in decision making on their programs.

The procedures followed in developing the 1969-70 OWP included:

1. The Indian university officials and the associated contract teams jointly drafted the working papers.

2. These working papers were then reviewed in conference with ICAR, the AID Contract Representative, Indian University officials, and the Contract Chief of Party and appropriate advisors. This approach provides an opportunity for all of the concerned entities to participate in program decisions by exchange of information and viewpoints and possibly to achieve a common understanding and agreement.

In Conclusion

This brief report indicates some of the areas of major concern among the contract teams under the present contractual provisions and in working relationships with GOI and AID. Renewal of the present type of contract or development of new contracts or agreements will provide opportunity for adjustments.

REPORT FROM AID/W

Summary of Comments by Dr. James Blume
Director, Office of Technical Support, NESA
Washington, D. C.

We can expect changes in the AUD project as conditions change. There have been personnel changes, too, and new leaders can be expected to have their own views about programs. In India, the Mission has a new Mission Director, Mr. Saccio, it will have a new Deputy Director, and Gordon Evans is going in as the Program Officer. In AID/W, John Young has replaced Andy Renshaw.

Agricultural production continues high in India, but USAID is expressing doubt that a 5% increase rate can be maintained. Much depends on rice. USAID estimates 26% of India's 91 million acres of rice are under high yield varieties but rice HYV is not as good as wheat HYV. Rice is more exacting in water control and plant protection. Maize, sorghum, millets individually are not very important but together constitute 25% of total grain production. Also, they often are the crops of poorest farmers so they have a social importance.

More attention is being paid to social and political problems as Mrs. Gandhi attempts to fashion a left-of-center majority. Equitable distribution of profits of the green revolution is a real problem. As the Mission notes, India's problems cannot be solved by redistributing income of $80.00 per capita. However, India cannot afford windfalls to the prosperous either. To date, there is little or no evidence that the green revolution favors larger farmers. It does favor the lands with good water supplies.

The Mission proposes in its newest field submission to go ahead with the AUD and APP programs. The GOI has indicated a desire for help with several new institutions. Cooperation on these will require contractions somewhere else.

The financial stringencies under which AID has operated are not likely to improve markedly in the near future. Disbursements have exceeded appropriations for each of the past five years and the pipeline has been considerably reduced. Another factor influencing future assistance programs is the feeling in the American Embassy that there are too many Americans in India.

The role proposed for USAID in agriculture includes:

1. Provide foreign exchange for agricultural inputs-particularly fertilizer. USAID partly concerned with meeting needs--partly concerned with having adequate inventories to keep pressure of domestic producers to maintain marketing efforts.

2. Consider new capital and technical assistance in water control and land development.

3. Continue assistance to agricultural universities and agricultural production teams.

4. Broaden research in agricultural economics to include more attention to income distribution and social problems.

We believe FY71 will be a year of decision in the agricultural universities project. Basic question Director Saccio is asking how this project can best solve production and social problems of Indian agriculture.

1. He is uncomfortable that the problems have changed without a corresponding change in assistance patterns.

2. A recent audit report on India was generally favorable to this project but criticized it for (a) lack of phase out plans for the individual sub-projects (b) insufficient reflection of developmental status of the various Indian universities in the assistance patterns.

3. Dr. Frank Parker has privately expressed concern over:

   (a) poor relationships between universities and agricultural departments.

   (b) increasing provincialism in choice of faculty and students.

We think there are good prospects for some support through an Endowment Program using PL 480 rupees.

1. The Indian cabinet has approved the principle of endowments in three areas: These are IIT's, ag universities and HUDCO.

2. The ground rules are not yet clear.

3. The IIT probably will be first to move with money controlled by a government board which already coordinates the IIT's.

4. In the case of agricultural universities, endowments might go to them individually or to some allocative organization. The assumption is that the Ministry of Agriculture, ICAR and the University Association will compete for control.

5. Secretary I.G. Patel has mentioned 14 agricultural university claimants. Dr. Hannah demurred at that number but it is not clear whether he would limit numbers on basis of quality or U. S. associations. Probably it would be the former.

6. It is expected that disbursements will be limited to interest, but there might be some invasion of capital for HUDCO.

7. Amounts are not settled but possibly something like rs. 50-75 million each for IIT's and agricultural universities, and rs. 200 million or more for HUDCO.

I believe the lack of clear-cut phase out plans, particularly for those universities which are doing well, is a handicap. In contrast, assistance to the IIT at Kanpur has been given against a specified terminating date from the beginning. The date is going to slip only one year, which is pretty good for a 10-year project. Having a definite date has forced the IIT, the Ministry and the contractor to face up to problems more bluntly than they might otherwise have done. It made them look for other ways to maintain some kind of linkage. The use of U. S. rupees for endowments in which the agricultural universities may share, is the result of Kanpur looking for something beyond the standard assistance pattern.

COMMENTS FROM USAID/Delhi

Summary of Remarks by O. A. Bauman
Deputy Assistant Director

There is a feeling that the university programs and technical assistance programs are becoming stereotyped. The Mission is looking for new ideas from the large staff of university people engaged in the Indian program. In the past, much of the technical assistance provided by the universities has not been well used by the Indians.

In the past year, many new ideas have been advanced including administrator Hannah's statement before the Land-Grant Association last year and Director Saccio's comments at Ludhiana in February. The Mission is looking for new innovations that will still satisfy the GOI requirement that negotiation of agreements must be on a government-to-government basis. It should also be noted that the President, and the American Ambassador think the American presence in India should be reduced.

Mr. Bauman presented copies of a discussion paper: "Technical Assistance for Agricultural University Development--a Re-examination" which had been prepared by Russell Olson. The Mission desires Council reaction to it. It has not been discussed with the GOI. The proposal sets up a corps of experts at the Center, but there is still a desire to foster university-to-university relationships. It is hoped these will continue independently and indefinitely.

General Discussion

Mr. Blume wanted to know how many participants had been cleared this year. Thorpe said none had as of July 12. Bauman observed that the Mission could hold to the agreed March 1 cut-off date if the Universities would refuse to accept late registrants.

Dr. Bentley wanted to know what the employment prospects were at the Indian universities. Thorpe said there were no problems at MUAS, but in the future there probably would be. The experimental stations are placing thirty graduates on six-acre tracts of land which they will operate for a year, and keep the profits. Banks are employing graduates and the agricultural polytechnics will require some. Dr. Renne noted that some university departments were cutting down on enrollment to fit employment needs.

Dr. Larson wanted to know how the Indian universities were relating to state agencies. Blume said some of them had done very well in getting state support and noted that Dr. Thapar, PAU, was a master at getting funds. Hixson noted that since the beginning, controls have been moving away from the universities to the State officials. Boards of control have heavy representation of State officials.

THE 211(d) PROGRAM
ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND PROSEPCTS:

Experience at OSU

(Digest of Comments by Trevor Arscott
211(d) Professor at OSU)

The absence of Dr. Erven J. Long was regretted, in view of the fact that he as the originator would have been better equipped to outline the objective of the 211-d program.

The Objective of the 211-d Program

To develop at Ohio State University an expertise and capability in international agronomy through involvement, research and teaching. India is being used as a laboratory to fulfill the objectives of the program.

The 211-d Program over the past 2 years

The Agronomy Department has been fortunate in having a chairman who has always had an interest in international programs and the existing international affairs office under the direction of Dr. Mervin Smith has been most helpful in making things easier for the 211-d program.

However, not more than four years ago the international dimension in the department was something that was left to the other man and consisted more of a limited interest of some recently returned traveller from overseas.

With the inception of the 211-d program, this has changed. The change to a greater awareness of the international dimension has been accomplished by involving both faculty and students in international activities of the department and college.

At this time we are engaged in completing an international agronomy symposium on campus. This symposium has opened the eyes of both students and faculty to the international arena. A sincere attempt was made to involve as many faculty as possible in the planning and conducting the seminars which involve five experts in the field of soil, plant and water relationships.

Time and again the 211-d professor is taken back to his graduate days when such an opportunity of hearing and being exposed to five top men in the international field would have been invaluable to his training.

The symposium has made it possible for 211-d students from Penn State, Ohio State and Missouri to get together during the past few weeks. A distinct camaraderie has developed between these students and there is a feeling among them that is uniquely 211-d.

The inability of one of our symposium speakers to attend due to illness, presented an opportunity for involvement of other faculty members within the college. In this regard, Drs. Bill Wayte, Clyde Allison and L.D. Baver admirably filled the gap left by Dr. E.J. Wellhausen's absence.

The amount of the 211-d grant is modest. It is $200,000 for five years which breaks down to $40,000 per year. After taking out the 211-d professors salary, there is not that much left for the program operation. For this reason the 211-d grant is used as a seed source to generate more operating capital which is then used to develop the international dimension of the college and department. A case in point is the current international seminar which would never have even been conceived had not the seed source of 211-d funds been available.

An appeal was then made for continuation of the grant and justification for such a continuation was based on:

(a) The greater interest and desire of more students for participation in the 211-d program, and

(b) The fact that we would not wish to saddle existing students supported by the program with the stigma of a program that "folded after five years".

In conclusion it was pointed out that enthusiasm was high and that the 211-d program at O.S.U. was a viable, forward looking program, materially improving the international dimension of the department and the college.

General Progress of the 211-d Program

(Comments by O.J. Scoville
Executive Director of CUSURDI)

Encouraging progress is being made at each of the six institutions and when the activity is viewed collectively, the total of achievement is greater than the sum of the separate projects.

New courses are being added, but the international aspects of existing courses are getting increased attention also. Notable additions to instruction include the summer seminar on international agronomy, and the addition of three new graduate courses at O.S.U., and new PhD concentration in Economics of Agricultural Development being offered at Tennessee, the interdisciplinary course on International Food Crops at Illinois, the international agronomy seminar at Missouri and new courses in Tropical Crop Production at Penn State and Kansas State University. New and relevant teaching materials are being produced at most institutions.

The net effects of 211(d) on teaching are:

(a) Direct participation of 211(d) programs in teaching courses related to international development;

(b) Expansion in supply of teaching materials;

(c) More effective teaching as a result of the opportunity to study abroad;

(d) Stimulus to other university efforts in teaching international agricultural subjects;

(e) Increased numbers or graduate students preparing for courses in international agriculture. At the end of the second year there were fifteen graduate students enrolled under the program.

With respect to research competence, the universities have found the experience of planning and conducting research overseas very helpful. Linkages are also being established between work on development problems abroad and on similar problems in this country. The research on the 211(d) program is stimulating interest among their colleagues, and cooperative efforts are developing with other students in this country and in India.

The 211(d) professors are becoming increasingly called upon to consult on international problems, and most of them have been appointed to campus committees dealing with curriculum planning.

All of the 211(d) professors comment on the increasing involvement of their universities in problems of world food production. Some of this would have occurred without the 211(d) programs, but the grants have speeded up the process. At Kansas State, the Department of Grain Science and Industry has long been involved in international work, and about 60% of the graduate students are from foreign countries. Similarly, the University of Illinois is gaining increasing recognition within the state of the idea that the university should develop world-wide competence in understanding phenomena related to soybeans. At OSU a study year abroad program for agriculture undergraduates has been started. In all states there is growing appreciation of the world food problem and the need for state institutions to understand it and be able to contribute to its solution.

Discussion

There was considerable discussion of the problems of improving relations with the GOI and with USAID/Delhi in the operation of the 211(d) program. Dean Larson stressed the need for the Mission to become more interested in and supportive of the program. He wondered also if it would be helpful if the vice chancellors conveyed to GOI their interest in cooperating with the U. S. universities on it. Dean Bentley emphasized the value of the program in augmenting the supply of qualified menpower for international work.

THE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION PROMOTION PROGRAM

Summary of Comments
By Dr. Pendergrass

The APP program provided an opportunity to do a job that was not being done--to help close the gap between technical knowledge and the application of it. It also provided a means of establishing cooperation between the universities and the State Departments of Agriculture. The program gave an opportunity for the universities to demonstrate to the public and to state government officials that there could be joint inter-agency programs.

A big problem remains in getting extension to perform as it should. The universities are not involved in this activity adequately, but APP is giving the universities a chance to show what they can do.

Much attention has been given to the evaluation of programs in India. As far as Mysore is concerned, the program has in part achieved the dual objectives of increasing food production and demonstrating an effective extension operation by a university. Tamil Nadu has partially achieved the food production objective.

Looking to the future, it is doubtful if all the objectives will have been achieved in five years, and some new aspects need increasing emphasis, such as marketing, transport and storage. Maybe five years is not enough, but the universities need to plan for the eventual termination of these programs.

In general, Dr. Pendergrass said he was well pleased with progress of the APP programs.

Summary of Comments by Mr. Bauman

Mr. Bauman endorsed all of the remarks of Dr. Pendergrass. He stressed that the ultimate goal of the program was to help achieve a fully-integrated university responsible for teaching, research, and extension. He feels that encouraging progress is being made in this direction.

The activity is expected to terminate at present locations in five or six years. The AUD programs should encourage activities that would absorb the APP work. The GOI is interested in opening up new APP activities in other states with the idea that total numbers of advisors would be kept at present levels.

Summary of Comments by Dr. Floyd Smith

At first, Kansas State was not sure as to where it could recruit personnel for APP. The outlying experiment stations were found to be a useful source, drawing in a different kind of personnel from the ones usually recruited for the AUD program. These men usually have a different background and training and usually hold only a Masters Degree.

Dr. Smith hears encouraging reports from the field and the executive visitors on progress of APP. He feels it is a good program.

A crude inventory should be taken to find out what kinds of personnel we now have in the program and our future needs. There are indications that more economists may be needed to work in farm management and marketing. As projects are phased out, a mechanism will be needed to absorb the kinds of people that have been useful in the APP program.

Monday Afternoon July 20-

SECOND WORLD FOOD CONGRESS

The Hague, Netherlands
June 16-30, 1970
Report by James Blume

1970 is a year of anniversaries. It is the 25th anniversary of the U. N.; it is the 25th anniversary of the FAO; it is the starting date of the U. N. Disarmament Decade and the Second Development Decade. It also closely follows the release date of the Indicative World Plan for Agricultural Development. I suppose all of those facts contribute to making 1970 an appropriate date for the Second World Food Congress.

The First World Food Congress was held in Washington in 1963. Like the Second it was sponsored by F.A.O. The First Congress was addressed by John F. Kennedy and his challenge was repeatedly quoted by speakers at the Second:

> "We have the means, we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the earth in our lifetime. We need only the will."

And, a good many speakers cited the Green Revolution as evidence both that the capacity existed to produce enough food and that "the capacity" was effective only when it was accompanied by "the will". The Second World Food Congress was attended by perhaps 1200 people from F.A.O. member countries. There were no official delegates. Although there had been consultation between F.A.O. and member countries over the invitation list all who attended participated as individuals. There was a deliberate effort to attract young people to the Congress. I would guess that of the about 100 Americans at the Congress, perhaps 25 of them were in the youth category. Most of the young people were quartered in Youth Village, an old military camp, at rates of about $2.00 per day.

The Congress agenda included about five days of plenary sessions and about the same amount of time or a little more during which the participants were divided into four groups. During the first week, these groups had the following assignments:

Commission I - Ensuring Basic Food Supplies
Commission II - Higher Living Standards and Improved Diets
Commission III - People in Rural Development
Commission IV - Trade Patterns and Policies

During the second week, the grouping shifted to the following:

Commission V: Public Sector Support
Commission VI: Private Sector Support
Commission VII: Direct Participation Programs
Commission VIII: Mobilization of Public Opinion

The Commission sessions were devoted almost entirely to comments from the floor. Usually the Chairman made brief introductory remarks and some times two or three others were assigned 15-minute talks but with those exceptions all other talking was done by intervenors from the floor. The plenary sessions were usually started by comments from a panel of three or four members who sat on the platform. After the first hour or so, the meeting was open to intervention from the floor.

As might be expected, the combination of emphasis on the widest possible participation and on individual rather than group responsibility led to a somewhat chaotic meeting. Those who spoke most often, those who spoke most fervently and those who were hardest to shut up included the evangelist, the militants and the lunatic fringe. Speakers were not greatly influenced by the topic assigned for the meeting. I heard an old Scotsman who said he was born in Bihar and now lived in Stockholm make the same speech on the virtues of oil barrels for grain storage in four different sessions. A participant from Cuba praised Cuba's adult literacy campaign in at least three sessions. And I don't think I attended a single session in which there were not at least two speakers who praised land reform at some length.

One might ask whether anything at all was accomplished in that kind of meeting. I doubt that the benefits exceeded the costs but there were some benefits. In my judgement these include:

1. Those of us from the developed countries learned a little more about the frustrations felt by the people in the LDC's. The "have nots" had a chance to lambaste the "haves" and they did. I found out how much some of them resent high salaried foreigners, young advisors, tied aid and the administrative, political and economic weaknesses which put their own country at a disadvantage in dealing with developed countries.

2. I found out how popular it was among many participants to blame the LDC problems on the past (colonialism) or on the present power structure (economic exploitation, capitalistic imperialism, North American imperialism).

3. I learned how sincerely many of the participants believed that economic development could occur only if there were radical changes in the social and political structure within their own countries.

4. I saw American youth beset on the one hand by distrust for the establishment and on the other by a growing suspicion that they were being used by radical European militants. The education of the American Youth may have been one of the greatest benefits of the meeting. The American delegation under the leadership of Dorothy Jacobson and Don Parlberg held regular meetings with the U. S. youth contingent. Near the end of the meetings the young people came up with a statement addressed to the people of the United States which the U. S. group accepted as reasonable and we all signed. It urged that the U. S. Government (a) give top priority to elimination of hunger and malnutrition, (b) sponsor imaginative and well-funded A. I. D. programs and (c) do everything possible to support price stabilization and assure LDCs an increasing share of the U. S. domestic market. While there were one or two exceptions, the U. S. Youth group were reasonable. They were asking for help in defending the U. S.

against the European militants. They were also asking that the U. S. do less talking and more action.

5. I saw how generally accepted is the thesis that food production will not improve very much in the absence of improvement in other sectors. There was general acceptance of the likelihood that it would be more difficult to solve employment problems than food production problems.

6. There was a split on population problems. The Western countries, India, Pakistan, Japan, Korea, etc. all emphasized the need for population problems as did all or nearly all of the panel members, regardless of origin. However, many of the Latin American delegates made fiery speeches against family planning, as did some of the Africans.

The plenary sessions were addressed by many prominent people. Among them were:

U. Thant,

A. H. Boerma;

B. R. Sen,

S. L. Mansholt,

R. Prebisch,

B. J. Udink,

L. B. Pearson,

S. Chandrasekhar,

Ian Timbergen,

R. Campos

R.K.A. Gardiner,

F. T. Wahlen,

David Owen,

Ritchie Calder,

Roger Revelle.

THE INDIAN AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITIES EVALUATION PROJECT

T. S. Sutton and W. N. Thompson

I. Organization and Objectives

A. Sponsorship. The agency for International Development took the initiative in setting up the project with the Government of India appointing a joint Indo-American Study Team with concurrence of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research and USAID; Punjab Agricultural University was used as the case study for the evaluation; the Council of U. S. Universities for Rural Development in India provided administrative support; Project conducted from November 1969 to April 1970.

B. Team Members. Dr. O. P. Gautam, Deputy Director General, Indian Council of Agricultural Research; Dr. J. S. Patel, former India Commissioner of Agriculture and retired Vice Chancellor, J. Nehru Agricultural University; Dr. T. Scott Sutton, Associate Dean Emeritus, The Ohio State University; and Dr. W. N. Thompson, Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois.

C. Objectives.

1. Develop method and procedure for assessing progress of agricultural universities.

2. Assessment of progress of Punjab Agricultural University.

3. Specify essential elements of an agricultural university.

4. Demonstrate institutional elements that need to be considered on a continuing basis.

D. Project Reports. Two reports have been published by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research:

1. A Method of Assessing Progress of Agricultural Universities in India, I.C.A.R., April 1970, 128pp.

2. The Punjab Agricultural University, An Assessment of Progress to 1970, I.C.A.R., April 1970, 153 pp.

Three thousand copies of each of the reports have been printed with I.C.A.R. to be responsible for distribution. AID/Washington will assist with distribution in the U. S. and to AID Missions.

II. Development of Evaluation Method

The report on A Method of Assessing Progress of Agricultural Universities in India consists of three chapters: Chapter I, The Institution Building Framework; Chapter II, The Agricultural University - Essential Features; and Chapter III, Assessment Methods and Procedures. An Appendix contains eight questionnaires that were used in the study.

The institution-building model and outline of the essential features of an agricultural university provide the frameworks for the evaluation.

A. The Institution-Building Model

Institution Variables		Environmental Linkages
Resources		Enabling
Internal Structure		Functional
Programs	Relationships	Normative
Leadership	⟵ ⟶	Diffused
Doctrine		

B. Essential Features

a. Administration
b. Development plan
c. Colleges
d. Departments
e. Tenure and promotion policy
f. Resident instruction
g. Research programs
h. Extension programs
i. Library
j. Spirit and doctrine

C. The Evaluation Procedure

Data were collected from many sources with heavy dependence on questionnaires, interviews, and field observations.

a. Reports -- annual, research, etc.

b. Questionnaires followed by interviews --- department heads, college deans, research and extension directors, librarian

c. University officer interviews

d. Faculty questionnaire

e. Student questionnaire

f. Campus activity observations

g. Off-campus interviews and observations

Research stations, extension activities, farms, state and center government officials, research and education leaders, board of management members, etc.

Data summary and interpretation
Report preparation

III. Effectiveness of Method and Procedures

Limitations of testing at one university

Generally effective -- obtained depth of insights into strengths and weaknesses of PAU. Institution elements; questionnaire and interviews of department heads and deans very effective; questionnaire information reliable and response good; importance of top-level administrative support for evaluation.

Problems -- lack of comparable data in reports from year to year; inconsistency of data from different sources (e.g. staff numbers); lack of information on some things (e.g. graduates and employment); data compilation, clerical and stenographic assistance; time to thoroughly understand degree of development of effective linkages.

IV. Assessment of Progress at Punjab Agricultural University

The report on Punjab Agricultural University consists of a list of 15 recommendations of university-wide significance and 16 chapters covering 138 printed pages plus 15 pages of appendices. Obviously, the report must be read in its entirety to enable one to grasp its full significance. In addition to the information obtained from the questionnaires of faculty, students, and administrators, a great deal of information was gleaned from a variety of reports, statistical data and other documents.

No attempt is made in this presentation to fully cover the report. Indeed, if this statement merely whets the appetite for a full reading it will have served its purpose.

A. The Reocmmendations. Since the recommendations of university-wide significance will, no doubt, be the primary objective of many readers, they have been given a prominent place in the report. Under general headings they can be listed as follows:

1. Create the post of Director of Resident Instruction
2. Integrate the three functions at the college level
3. Develop a policy statement on ranks, tenure and promotions
4. Make academic administrative posts fixed tenure positions
5. Assign each faculty member to parent discipline department
6. Attach newly-developed areas to related departments
7. Delegate budgets clearly to deans and heads
8. Organize regular teaching seminars
9. Develop depth of administrative leadership
10. Broaden the scope of research and extension
11. Acquire more land

12. Improve communications with students

13. Establish a placement service

14. Develop and foster an alumni assosiation

15. Improve record keeping

These recommendations originated from observations made during the course of the study and were discussed with the Vice Chancellor with all of the study team present near the end of the project. Other recommendations either stated or implied are to be found in the body of the report. These usually deal with matters of interest on a college, department or other administrative subdivision basis.

B. The Chapters. The body of the report is contained in the following 16 chapters:

1. History of PAU

2. The Rural Economy Served by PAU

3. The University Objectives, Structure, Finances, Personnel

4. Resident Instruction - Students and Curricula

5. Resident Instruction - Teaching and Student Evaluation

6. Research Program

7. The Extension Education Program

8. Integration of Teaching, Research and Extension

9. The Essential Components, The Colleges and Departments

10. The University Library

11. Student Welfare

12. Faculty Development and Welfare

13. Communications and Printing

14. The Physical Plant

15. The Linkages to Other Institutions

16. PAU and Rural Welfare

A careful reading of these chapters will reveal a great deal about the Punjab Agricultural University and the state it serves.

From a faculty of 103, a student body of 897 and a budget of about 2,000,000 rupees in 1962, the University has now reached a faculty of

560, a student body of 1,820 and a budget of about 40,000,000 rupees. These budget figures do not include the financial support from USAID and the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations.

A good index of the vitality of a university is the use made of the library. Good library records have been kept since 1965. Books issued have increased from 22,879 in 1965 to 215,369 in 1969. During the same period readers increased from 52,391 to 209,413 and the library budget has increased from 73,237 to 763,305 rupees. Library personnel has increased from 15 to 60. A new library that has a floor area of 7,500 square meters, seating space for 760 readers in airconditioned comfort, and space for 300,000 books is now under construction.

You will want to read the summaries of the questionnaires. The University has housing accommodations for 1,350 students and the messes are run by the students. Their answers to the questionnaire rated the hostel accommodations better than good with a similar rating for the quantity and quality of food. The general campus environment was rated about midway between "good" and "excellent."

The faculty questionnaires revealed that 66% of the faculty considered their salary levels competitive with other universities; 70% felt that the opportunity for advancement was an incentive for good work; 62% agreed that appointments were made on the basis of merit; 70% were of the opinion that the University had an adequate scheme for rewarding outstanding work but only 47% agreed that there was a staisfactory mechanism for selecting those to receive rewards for outstanding work. The questionnaires also reveal that the faculty as a whole was not satisfied with the extent of faculty participation in the affairs of the University.

C. The Research Program. About 41% of the University budget is allocated to research. During 1969-70 about 200 research schemes were in operation; only 13% of these were in the animal field. In addition to the schemes, some 800 projects were underway. The proportion of the departmental budget allocated to research in those departments where there is a major research thrust is as follows: Plant Breeding, 67%; Horticulture, 67%; Soils, 64%; Chemistry and Biochemistry, 64%; Agricultural Engineering, 57%; Zoology and Entomology, 54%; and Economics and Sociology, 51%.

During 1968-69 the publications from the PAU staff numbered 791.

D. The Extension Program. The Extension Directorate at PAU has three principal segments. These are an Agricultural Information Department, a training branch under the Department of Extension Education and a Farm Advisory Service.

The Agricultural Information Department has the responsibility for the quick release of research and extension recommendations through radio, press releases, literature produced by the University and exhibits at important fairs.

The training branch runs short courses in agricultural subjects, generally on-campus, for farmers, public workers and officials associated with the development of agriculture.

The Farm Advisory Service operates mostly outside the campus promoting the adoption of new scientific materials and methods.

To mention only a few of the programs or services of a year's operation:

Agronomy: 287 demonstration centers, 597 demonstration plots, 258 exhibits, and 59 field days.

Horticulture: 397 demonstrations, 2,500 advisory visits, 25 orchard rejuvenations.

Plant Protection: 257 demonstration centers, 579 demonstration centers, 43 exhibits.

Soils: 67,500 farm soils, 16,569 garden soils and 3,453 reclamation soil samples analyzed, a total of 87,522 samples. In addition, an extension program of demonstrations, exhibits and other educational techniques were carried on helping to get maximum benefits from the results of soil analyses.

These have been only samples, a taste of you please, of the the information regarding the PAU contained in the report. There are areas of great strength and areas of serious weakness. I am sure we didn't find all of them. I hope you will not be satisfied until you read the whole report.

In conclusion, I would like to quote the concluding paragraph:

"To determine just how much of the tremendous increase in food production can be attributed to the Punjab Agricultural University would be an impossible task. Without the necessary inputs of fertilizer, credit, plant protection chemicals, profitable prices, improved seeds and industrious farmers, the University could have little or no impact. Similarly, without the input of the Punjab Agricultural University in terms of educated people, research results and the 'know-how' of extension education, the use of the available inputs would go begging. But when all the elements are assembled in a balanced program effort the results are likely to exceed the expected."

HOW OSU AND PAU CAN USE THE EVALUATION
Summary of Comments by Dean Kottman

The Universities can use the evaluation. We need the series of benchmarks provided by it to point out areas of strength and weakness.

The reports from this evaluation can be used also in Rajasthan and other states.

The evaluation is timely because PAU has the ability to fly on its own in many areas. In these strong areas, future relations will be more nearly on an institution-to-institution, and faculty-to-faculty basis. We will expect a two-way street with cooperation flowing to OSU also. The evaluation will help focus future assistance on the weak areas.

Summary of Comments by Dr. Cecil Lamb

PAU is well integrated in teaching, research and extension. The extension work is coordinated and effective.

Indian University development has been more rapid than it was either in Canada or the United States.

The evaluation will be of great value--a real measure of the situation. The Vice-Chancellor will have a mine of information to help in decision-making. The study presents a balanced viewpoint, and will help him avoid undue influence by aggressive deans and department heads. The evaluation will help in guiding plans for technicians, consultants and participants. The faculty will have qualms about some features, such as the concept of term appointments for administrators.

Summary of Comments by Dr. Mervin Smith

Dr. Smith gave his views on what the evaluation report means for the future of OSU and PAU collaboration.

This evaluation report has been made at a most opportune time, when PAU and OSU are attempting to plan our future relations.

PAU and OSU have expressed to each other during the last year interest in developing a strong relationship and cooperation for the future. This summer while Dr. Cecil A. Lamb, our Chief of Party at PAU, was on home leave, we started drafting a proposal for a grant of funds to facilitate a joint program between OSU and PAU in the future. So far, it has been discussed only with some departments at OSU. It has not been reviewed or considered by PAU. Please bear in mind as I present it to you here that PAU will be reviewing and probably changing it considerably. We will welcome suggestions for the further development of the proposal.

Needs for Joint Programs and Mutual Assistance

The Ohio State University technical assistance program up to the present time has contributed substantially to the excellent progress made by the Punjab Agricultural University. The continuation of this OSU technical assistance would be highly valuable to the development of PAU. However, the development of PAU has reached a stage where this could be provided as part of a mutual assistance program consisting of joint and cooperative research and education. Such a program will require financial support from AID, Foundations or other sources. Not only PAU's further development will be benefited, but also OSU can be benefited by such programs. The Ohio State University needs to develop its international dimension and PAU could make an important contribution to this. The competence of faculty at both OSU and PAU would be improved. More rapid development in research, teaching and extension will be catalytic and enriching to both institutions. More and more to attain a high level of development in any profession in agriculture, the professional must develop linkages with top professionals everywhere in the world, and he needs to broaden his experiences into other parts of the world.

The joint programs should be developed with recognition of priority needs of each institution. Flexibility and timeliness will be important so that each institution can meet the needs of the other institution with the involvement of the best qualified faculty at the right time. The institutions will need to take the responsibility of providing the best qualified personnel and efficient management of the program.

A number of examples can be mentioned where the one institution is developing an area in which the other institution has strong faculty and experience. This is the situation where PAU is developing a facility for the use of radio-active isotopes in agricultural research and OSU has a faculty with much experience in this field. Joint programs and mutual assistance could be developed in this field. Many ideas for cooperation and joint programs will arise from time to time as faculty cooperate and communicate with each other.

At first, more visiting professors will be going from OSU to PAU than from PAU to OSU because PAU has need for developing many departments and will benefit most from visiting professors. Likewise, at first, more faculty studying abroad will go from PAU to OSU because of the need for more training of the PAU faculty. As more PAU faculty become highly qualified, more professors from PAU will become visiting professors at OSU.

The detailed joint and mutual assistance programs will need to be planned and developed by each of the disciplines and specialized areas in the two Universities. While plans will be developed for five or more years ahead, they will need to be adjusted and left flexible enough to accommodate the changing of priorities and needs each year.

Commitments to Each Other - OSU and PAU

A strong relationship already exists between the two Universities. Many of the administrators and faculty at the two institutions have worked

together and have had opportunity to see the other institution. This relationship and linkage needs to be continued and further developed. As departments and individual faculty members from the two institutions work together, they will become more strongly committed to each other. This joint program and mutual assistance would bring about a very strong commitment of PAU and OSU to each other. Each institution will become a foreign center and resource for the other. Using these extra resources in a complementary manner will make both institutions stronger and will benefit both countries.

Joint Programs

Faculties from the two institutions will develop joint research projects and programs of mutual interest and benefit. Visiting professors, faculty and graduate students from both institutions will be involved in such projects. The research problems may be in Ohio or in the Punjab or in both places. Such research collaboration might continue for many years with faculty and graduate students moving back and forth as required.

High priority areas for joint research will evolve as departments and faculty communicate and work together. However, some of these areas are already apparent. The area of soils, water and plant fertility is one where a beginning has already been made for joint programs involving Departments of Soils, Agronomy, Horticulture and Agricultural Engineering. Joint programs of research in agricultural economics and rural sociology are likely to be developed, especially with agricultural business and population research. The areas of food technology and nutrition have strong mutual interest. These joint efforts are most likely with the strong departments at PAU where research capability has been developed. More time will be needed to develop this with weak departments, where it will be necessary at first to have an OSU professor as a visiting professor at PAU to help develop the research capability.

Outstanding faculty from both universities will team up to develop and participate in symposia or conferences held either at Ohio State University or at the Punjab Agricultural University. Both Universities may be called upon by central and other agencies in each country to cooperate and provide professional resources for conferences and professional meetings at central or other locations.

The two universities will cooperate on programs of study for faculty, graduate students, undergraduate students, post doctoral programs and others which seem to be mutually beneficial. Part of the training program for both OSU students and PAU students can be taken at the sister university.

Cooperation between faculty from each institution can take place on special educational demonstration and training programs. Occasionally a problem may arise either in the Punjab or in Ohio which requires immediate concentrated research and/or special training efforts. Faculty specialized in the problem area may be called upon from the sister university as visiting professors to help with the work.

Facilitating the Programs

The joint programs will be facilitated in the following manner:

Visiting Professors. This will include OSU faculty going to PAU for from 1 to 12 months, or in special cases for two years, and PAU professors going to OSU for similar periods. These professors will be engaged in one or a combination of the following activities:

(a) Research
(b) Teaching
(c) Extension
(d) Institutional operations and services

Faculty Study Abroad. Faculty from PAU will go to OSU for study programs and OSU faculty will go to PAU for study. These will be of the following types:

(a) Study for advanced degree at the other institution
(b) Joint study between the two institutions for an advanced degree awarded at either one of the universities
(c) Post-Doctoral Study
(d) Short-term study for special training, observation and experience.

Students Study Abroad. There will be PAU students going to OSU and OSU students going to PAU for one or more quarters or trimesters. These will be of the following types:

(a) Graduate students
(b) Undergraduate students
(c) Special students

Exchange of special Agriculturists and Leaders from Ohio and the Punjab. Ohio people going to Punjab and Punjab people going to Ohio, including farmers, agricultural business leaders, and community leaders.

Exchange of teaching materials and audio visual aids.

Exchange of scientific materials and data for research.

Exchange of publications and library materials.

HOW CAN THE EVALUATION PRODCEDURE BE USED AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Summary of Comments by Mallory Thorpe,
Chairman, Field Operating Committee

With respect to **procedure,** it would be advisable to have a team that could evaluate several institutions to avoid bias. A combination of internal and external participants would be desirable, in order that staff members could become involved. This would set the stage for continuous evaluation and provide a pattern for follow-up evaluations.

The PAU study provides a measure of achievment of certain goals. It has the advantage of being comprehensive. There have been too many piecemeal evaluations. Several vice-chancellors have asked for an evaluation.

Evaluations should lead to action, including preparation of an academic plan and a long-range plan for campus development. These will help identify the future need for technical support.

Summary of Comments by
Dean Russell Larson

Part I of the PAU evaluation contains a number of assumptions about what a university should be. How valid are these assumptions? To what extent do these assumptions apply to Maharastra?

At Maharastra, Pennsylvania State hopes to follow through with the objectives envisioned for that institution. An evaluation will help, but the program is only three years old and it is to early for it.

A major weakness at present in Maharastra state is the lack of in-state support for the agricultural university. An evaluation should explore ways of building up needed support.

Summary of Comments by Oliver Bauman,
USAID, Delhi

The USAID-GOI evaluation of 1966-7 became a nightmare for USAID. The objective had been to convince the Ministry of Finance that it took money to develop these institutions, but some recommendations crept into the report that USAID did not have time to consider due to preoccupation with other matters. USAID desired new evaluations in order to guide the Mission and to help explain to Congress that it was seeking to keep its programs up-to-date.

It was fortunate that the PAU study became joint with GOI. This will widen use of the report.

The evaluation can be used at any of the Universities. The Mission hopes the Indians will take the lead in using the procedure, perhaps calling

for help from the U. S. universities. The evaluation will help to improve the quality of programs, and to determine when technical assistance can be terminated. For an effective technical assistance program, Indian imput must increase while our imput phases down. The evaluations should be used by U. S. universities as a guide to increase effectiveness of assistance and by the Indian universities as a means of identifying the need for assistance.

NEW TYPES OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE THAT SHOULD BE TRIED

Summary of Comments of Dean Orville Bentley

New kinds of programs will emerge as the Indian universities mature.

The Indian agricultural universities are becoming comprehensive universities with schools of basic sciences, home science, programs of education and perhaps even law schools. What kind of a comprehensive assistance program will be desirable in terms of our capabilities?

The Indian universities also are developing graduate capabilities. How many graduate programs should there be? What criteria are available to administrators to decide this? What is the relation of graduate work of the universities to IARI?

Questions are being raised about accreditation. What kind of accreditation is needed? Should it be approved by ICAR? What role should the Indian Association play in accreditation?

How can the universities develop more extensive research programs? There is need for more cooperative, interdisciplinary research on complex problems. The universities need to plan research at the university level. This is the kind of activity that can crack difficult problems and at the same time build up institutions. The Soybean Project is doing this, with ancillary benefits to the Illinois campus.

We need to establish better criteria for selection of kinds of consultants and advisors. This will be a more difficult problem with increased attention to highly specialized requirements. More lead time will be needed to get these people. The U. S. universities will face increasing difficulty in supplying the kinds of technical skills needed.

The planning of joint activities will tax our abilities. Better inducements will be needed to entice the top scientist. He will respond in terms of benefit to himself, to science and to his Indian colleague.

The U. S. colleges of agriculture should develop more student exchanges and should send more U. S. students abroad. There is need to expand graduate training in international agriculture. The need is broader than agriculture. The International Education Act recognized this need but it was never funded.

Who can help the Indian universities to improve their organization and program development? The multi-campus problem at Jabalpur is an example. In what ways can we assist the Indian association and ICAR with problems of these kinds?

Summary of Comments of Dean Kiehl

Second generation programs will need to give attention to the concept of international research networks. Initially, these might start within one country, but eventually they will involve multi-national programs of research. India already has the all-India schemes, but the Indian association is not really involved with these as yet.

In the United States we have had about twenty-five years experience with research networks. In 1966 a national program was developed jointly by the land-grant colleges and USDA. Ninety-one areas were considered and goals, priorities and manpower requirements were discussed. The next phase might be an international program network linking the top scientists. Some thinking on this idea appears in recent books by Lester Brown and Al Moseman.

In his history of Agricultural Experiment Stations in the U. S., Dr. Knoblauch observes that regional research allows intstitutions with limited resources in a certain field to link up with strong ones. This kind of program can be attractive to top-level scientists. They do not want to be advisors, but they do want to be involved.

Summary of Comments by Dr. Renne

Consideration of future programs should involve possible changes in approaches and changes in content. How can we improve the relevance of our programs to the solution of high-priority problems? How can we respond effectively to requests from new agricultural universities? If we were starting programs with new universities, would we use the same approaches and content as we did in the past?

With respect to the problem of accreditation, is a formal accreditation needed? The Land-Grant Association brought people together so effectively that everyone knew what the others were doing. The Indian Association can do this if it involves the people at college and department levels. The Indians have started to do this, and also to set up advisory councils to bring together strong representatives for various problem areas. These councils would make a stronger voice in Delhi for the universities. The universities, with some outside assistance, could also handle evaluation in this way.

There is need for a multi-disciplinary coordinated critical mass approach in the AUD program. In the past ten years we may have brought in too many individuals for single tours. The Coordinated Soybean Research Project is an example of the critical mass approach. It now involves 45 scientists: 20 at Jabalpur, 20 at Pantnagar and five at Illinois.

At least three other areas have high priority for a team approach:

food processing
water management
rural communications

For each subject area there should be teams of from two to perhaps five men. These would not all have to be present at the same time, but over a period of maybe five or more years there would be a well-planned sequence of tours. It is difficult to develop the coordinated team approach unless all fields are involved in the planning.

Some Indian universities are ready for the critical mass approach. One vice-chancellor has established a coordinated water technology board with the chairman reporting directly to him. Nine disciplines are represented: agricultural engineering, civil engineering, electrical engineering, agronomy, soils, water, physics, chemistry, and biology. Two technicans are requested: water science and soil, plant, water relationships. The technicans can be very helpful in getting such projects off the ground. The Ford Foundation project can help to facilitate such activities.

Several ideas are being advanced to improve technical assistance to the universities. Russ Olson has proposed the establishment of a top-level "swing team" of advisors and Indian counterparts. These would be available to help with specialized and difficult problems, and to do some of the initial advisory work at new universities.

We need to give more attention to the priority areas for technical assistance. How could the all-India projects be used to develop centers of excellence for India-wide programs at the agricultural universities?

What policy should be followed with respect to the new universities? Should we stick to the role of helping one university per state, or should the need for additional universities in the more populous states be recognized? Uttar Pradesh had twenty-seven colleges of agriculture. What help can we give administrators to decide what is to be done with them. Perhaps a "swing team" could help with this problem.

Discussion

Dr. Mervin Smith asked if the "swing team" would substitute for advisors at the universities. Dr. Hixson said the idea of the "swing team" would be to provide very high-level advisors. He mentioned Dr. Ellis as an example, and said his five weeks at Orissa did more good than any four of five other people could have done. He also observed that campus planning under James Miller was working out very well.

Dr. Blume asked if a person could have the loyalties of the universities if he resided in Delhi and was attached to ICAR. Dean Kottman felt that the university people, both Indian and U. S., would not be satisfied with a central service, because it would by-pass the elements of pride, loyalty and sister-institution relationship that are vital ingredients in university-to-university arrangements.

7:30P.M. Monday, July 20

Experiences of an OSU Undergraduate at PAU

Summary of Remarks by
Herbert J. Hadley

As many of you know, I am one of the two undergraduate Ohio State students who have recently returned from a years study at the Punjab Agricultural University in Ludhiana, Punjab, India. We were, to my knowledge, the first American undergraduate students to attend any university north of New Delhi, and are most probably among a very small number of students from America to attend agrucultural universities anywhere in India.

Since PAU was started in 1962, the Ohio State University has been sending OSU faculty to work at PAU and some of the PAU faculty have been coming to OSU for advanced training under AID and Foundation financing.

This program was initiated through the work of Dr. Mervin Smith, Assistant Dean and Coordinator of International Affairs of the College of Agriculture of the Ohio State University. Others closely involved in the beginnings of this program last year were Dean Roy M. Kottman and Assistant Dean Austin Ritchie of the OSU College of Agriculture and Home Economics. Through the work of these able administrators, a direct transfer of credits from PAU to OSU has now been assured. PAU has reached a stage in its development where undergraduate training there can be transferred to Ohio State University. This made this opportunity attractive to me.

Two students were involved in the program's first year. They were Greg Heisey, a Wildlife Management major, and myself, a Rural Sociology major. We went to India to study different aspects of the Indian environment.

My main interest is in what I call development sociology. I studied quite intensely the progress and problems generated by the various development schemes initiated by the Government of India as well as other outside agencies.

I left India with deep sorrow. I had made many friends there; friends I will not forget. Times were often hard, for India is inherently a difficult place for Westerners to live in, yet it was worth it.

The length of my stay in India demanded that I become very much "just another Indian" as one of my friends put it. We really had little choice.

We came to Punjab under essentially our own sponsorship. No financial aid was extended to us, neither were we given the privileges had by other Americans working for OSU and other organizations. We lived under very much Indian conditions because of this situation. We lived with the people.

eating their food, living in generally the same manner in which they lived. Certainly this was difficult, but I'm glad it happened that way. We learned a great deal by living in this manner.

A number of times in today's conference, which you were kind enough to allow me to attend, references were made to the 211(d) program and the so-called second generation programs of the various institutions involved in development in India. The comments often implied that it would be impossible for students on either the undergraduate or post-graduate level to live under common conditions of India. I disagree - I did it.

Let me just say this: I have traveled throughout India in the cheapest manner possible, I have stayed in hotel rooms that no middle-class Indian would sleep in (30 cents per night), I have traveled for less than a dollar a day, I have lived in an Indian manner and have attended an Indian university and have learned. If I can do this I believe others can too.

I am not, however, saying that every young student should pack a bag and go off to India, far from this. I am just saying that given a stable individual who sees a real reason for international study in India, a program will probably work. One did for me. This experience widened my view and deepened my character; it changed me, and I am glad.

I believe the year I have just spent in India will show itself to be the most important of my life. My hope is that other students from OSU as well as other universities of the U. S. can have the experiences I have gained.

So I say, let the programs now under way continue and other programs like it begin. India is a challenge. Let students, and others, meet it openly for self help as well as direct aid to the developing nation of India.

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITIES IN THE NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR INTERNATIONAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Ervin L. Peterson

Deputy Assistant Administrator
For Technical Assistance
Agency for International Development

The progress of mankind toward release from the need for the great masses of people to individually provide their food, clothing and shelter - as well as the emoluments of living - is directly relevant to the degree to which institutions have been created to investigate, record, teach and extend knowledge of natural forces and phenomenon. As man has learned so has his productivity increased. As productivity increased division of labor became possible so that more production occurred. Wealth was created, Capital was formed, Investment became possible. Taxation became an instrument for further development. Social overhead became manageable out of the production surplus. Knowledge, particularly scientific knowledge and the technical ability needed for its useful application became a key to rapid advancement of standards of living.

In the United States our system of Land Grant Colleges and state universities - and the trinity of research - education and extension which grew with them has made possible our preeminence in agricultural production and the industrial development which is associated with it.

It has been these institutions which have produced the brainpower to supply our agri-business complex. It has been the stimulus to universal education given by the creation and development of these institutions which has produced an educational concept from which now comes the annual output of brainpower which fuels our entire social-economic and political machinery. And it is to our educational institutions that we now look for the leadership to point the way for improving the quality of life that it may be a rich and rewarding experience as well as being a physically comfortable existence.

As a result of our own experience it is, I think, quite logical that we have now realized, after some two decades of foreign assistance endeavor that for A.I.D. recipient countries an essential for development is indigenous institutions capable of providing the research, the education and extension services within the recipient country's physical, social and political environment on which its rural development is necessarily based. It is these institutions which will develop the indigenous brainpower to fuel development endeavors.

It is equally logical that for its institution building effects in A.I.D. recipient countries our foreign assistance agency - A.I.D. - should have turned for help to U. S. Land Grant institutions. They have the expertise.

A.I.D. - University relations have developed over a period of time. We have had to learn how to work together effectively - and we are still learning. There is no need to now relate history. Suffice to observe that U. S. foreign assistance needs and will continue to need the active participation of the university community. That of the Land Grant institutions is of special importance to the multi-faceted aspects of the use and development of physical resources particularly in Agriculture and all that is associated with this fundamental area of human endeavor.

Correspondence received from your Executive Director, Dr. Scoville and from your Chairman, Dean Bentley, suggested that I look to the future of foreign aid and particularly pointed at the role of the University in International Rural Development. I shall try and do so. I would observe, however, that in my judgment Rural Development, while possibly requiring a separate international base, is otherwise inseparable from total development.

President Nixon's message to the Congress of May 28, 1969 emphasized enlistment of the energies of private enterprise in the course of economic development. It underscored innovative technical assistance, the furthering of food production and family planning. In his message the President proposed the establishment of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. Authorizing legislation was enacted, and the new corporation is in process of organization. He proposed "a strong new emphasis on technical assistance". A new Bureau - The Technical Assistance Bureau - has been created within A.I.D. and is operational. A principal thrust of the new Bureau is to improve the quality of technical assistance delivered in the field to recipient countries. It will do so by development of new knowledge and by mobilizing the most knowledgeable brainpower in the U. S. with which to attack the stubborn problems of development as they exist in the nations accepting and using development assistance. It will necessarily endeavor to utilize - hopefully in a mutually constructive manner - such resources as can be made available from the U. S. educational community. It will function, under the present organizational structure of A.I.D. as a support and resource arm for the Regional Bureau of the Agency. While its substantive areas of effort encompass the broad spectrum of human endeavor, there will necessarily be strong emphasis on the rural section, for in developing nations that is where the vast majority of the people are, and it is to this sector that nations look for their food supply.

Now as to the future -

In his message of May 1969, the President also emphasized the desirability of encouraging and supporting the multi-national organizations, and encouraging other advanced nations to fairly share the burden of international development.

Another step in the unfolding drama of foreign assistance was the joint letter to the President by A.I.D. Administrator Hannah and Secretary of Agriculture Hardin outlining significant areas for emphasis in agricultural development abroad. This report was accepted by the President. Its recommendations are in various stages of implementation. Within A.I.D. most of the supporting activities or actions will be carried by the TA Bureau.

Then on March 4, 1970 the Report to the President from the Task Force on International Development went forward. This is the now commonly referred to as the Peterson Report.

The history of U. S. foreign assistance and I refer only to development assistance - is one of organizational change. Motivating philosophy or doctrine seems to me to have been lacking. It may still be. I suspect it is for I doubt the general American public knows either what has been accomplished or what the problems are--nor the stakes involved. In any event, more organizational change is expected. If in accord to any substantial degree with the Peterson Report, programs will change also - at least in focus.

The U. S. is not alone in providing assistance to developing countries. A growing number of the more advanced countries also have foreign assistance programs. Coordination of effort becomes more essential. As a consequence I would expect emphasis on the use of development loans, on encouragement of private investment, and on use of multi-national organizations in the development assistance to be provided by the Unived States.

This leaves to be provided for directly funded technical assistance, the development of knowledge to make technical assistance effective, the research endeavor to fill the knowledge gaps, guidance for the creation of indigenous organizations and their institutionalization which will both mobilize and produce the brainpower essential for carrying on development activities, and the identification and strengthening of intermediary agencies capable and desirous of providing needed inputs for development of LDCs. I anticipate this latter group of activities to generally be encompassed within the functions of the International Development Institute proposed by the Peterson report.

Whatever the structural organization for the administration of U. S. foreign aid for economic and human development, I cannot conceive it being implemented without a growing involvement of the U. S. education community, and particularly that of our Land Grant Universities. With a growing focus on agriculture as a result of growing populations requiring food in adequate quantity and quickly, the development of this sector becomes a high priority objective. However, agriculture - the rural area - cannot reach its capacity in isolation from other aspects of development - economic - social and political. Our perspectives then need to reach beyond the rural scene and envision its linkages with total development. Since development to be continuous, must be indigenous, the focus of external assistnnce is upon helping to create and make viable those indigenous institutions essential to development processes. Perceptive observers recognize, I believe, that the transformation of physical resources into forms which fill human needs and wants requires scientific and technological capabilities adequate to the transformation process. The creation of those capabilities requires institutions to produce the needed brainpower, to conduct required research, to mobilize brainpower into organizations to stimulate and carry out the development activities. Thus external assistance can be most useful and effective in helping build the needed indigenous institutions. It is in this area our universities can play an effective role. Your help is needed. It is wanted. You have made an important beginning. U.S. A.I.D. and the universities have been learning together

how to best combine their efforts. Progress has been made. New forms of cooperative endeavor have been jointly developed. The 211(d) grant program to strengthen university international capability, and the new institutional development agreement are significant steps.

Our cooperative endeavors are not intended to be a one way street with all the benefits flowing to A.I.D. We hope and believe that our joint efforts will contribute toward the further growth and development of our universities, particularly toward their development as international centers of excellence; that the participation of university personnel in international development work, particularly in institution building will result in an international perspective which relates the interests of the United States to the interests of the community of nations, and that this perspective will be reflected throughout these institutions.

We live in a world where change is certain. I look upon our foreign assistance endeavors in the area of economic development as an investment intended to help create such a state of human well being that change may be peaceful and orderly wherever it occurs - and it will occur everywhere. The world's people have aspirations. They know that a better life is possible if not for themselves for their children. They want that better life. They will try and attain it by whatever means available. Our efforts are directed toward helping them to develop the means to achieve a better life by orderly and peaceful means. We can, I feel, be justly proud that we are making that effort.

We appreciate and welcome the participation of U. S. universities with us in this effort. Our task now is to continue our endeavors to make our joint efforts of greater effectiveness; to deepen and broaden our commitment to the task before us, and to create an understanding among the people of our country that the investment we are making on their behalf is worthy of their support. We recognize the magnitude of the challenge to us. It is worthy of the best we can offer. Let us then be sure we offer our best.

Tuesday, July 21

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Orlin J. Scoville

Council members have been furnished an advance copy of the formal report. Their suggestions and approval will be requested. My comments will touch upon items not covered by the report.

AID has agreed to extend the contract to June 30, 1972, with firm funding to March 31, 1971. The budget is approved with regular line items about as requested, but with the proposed three special activities eliminated. These were for short-term consultants to back up the LRAAA exercise, to advise with boards of management, and to help with follow-up on the evaluation. USAID said they would be willing to consider special activities as they found a strong need for them.

The new budget does increase the time of the Executive Director from 0.7 to 0.8. This will be very helpful, and I hope will permit more time for the development of proposals and studies of interest to the Council, including the foundation proposal, the development institute concept, employment prospects for Indian university graduates, etc.

The principal achievements of the Council in the past year have been:

1. The PAU Evaluation

2. The provision for shared services of technical advisors under which James Miller has been working

3. Assistance to the 211(d) project in solving administrative and conceptual problems

4. Establishment of the Campus Operating Committee to improve liaison between the Council and the Campus Coordinators.

5. Developmental work on the proposed Indian-American Fund

There are several ways in which the Council could increase its usefulness to the Mission and to the GOI. We can help with further evaluations, we could make special studies on crucial problems, we could help in finding the high-level talents desired by the Mission, and these could be utilized through our established procedures for the sharing of experts.

MINUTES CUSURDI BUSINESS SESSION

Columbus, Ohio
July 21, 1970

The meeting was called to order at 8:45 a.m. by Vice-President Pendergrass, the incoming chairman.

1. Minutes of previous meeting and approval of Annual Report.

   Moved by Dean Larson that the minutes of the February 18, 1970 meeting be approved as published, seconded by Kottman and carried.

   Moved by Dean Kottman that the draft Annual Report submitted by the Executive Director be accepted, seconded by Dean Kiehl and approved.

2. Report of nominating committee.

   Dean Kiehl reported that the nominating committee composed of himself and Vice-President Smith wished to nominate Dean Russell Larson as Vice-Chairman of the Council for the coming year. Dean Kottman then moved the election of Webster Pendergrass as Chairman of the Council, and Dean Larson as Vice-Chairman. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

3. Evaluation and Second Generation Programs.

   a. New Approaches.

      Mr. Bauman supplied the Council with copies of a paper by Russell Olson, "Technical Assistance for Agricultural University Development - A Re-examination." (Appendix C) This paper contains Dr. Olson's thinking about possible changes in technical assistance to improve effectiveness to the universities already established and to provide help to new universities. The essence of the proposal is the development of a small team of Indians with American advisors to operate from Delhi to give advice to the universities at very high levels with respect to university administration, research organization, curriculum development or legislation. The Council did not have time to consider the paper. Several questions were raised including the following: (1) Would this center advisory service be a new layer of assistance? (2) Would the U. S. participants be advisors to the Indian experts or members of a central panel? (3) What would be the role of the central advisory group with respect to new Indian institutions?

Dean Kiehl suggested that Dr. Thorpe should involve the Field Operating Committee so that we would have the benefit of their thinking. The Chairman of the Council asked Dean Larson to select other members to join

with him in a small committee to scrutinize the Olson paper and be prepared to give its views at the November Council meeting. The Director was asked to advise Dr. Olson that the Council had received his paper and would respond to it after their meeting in November.

b. Follow-up on the Punjab Evaluation.

With respect to the question of further evaluation studies similar to the one conducted for PAU, Mr. Bauman said that the Mission felt that the Indian Universities should request an evaluation if one was to be made. Further requests have already been received from four schools, Jabalpur, Mysore, Udaipur, and Pantnagar. A formal request has been made by Haryana. The Institute of Agriculture at Anand has asked for an evaluation and has requested that Mr. Patel be in charge of it. The Mission feels that any new universities should go through with the evaluation. Ephriam Hixson indicated that USAID might want the same team to conduct this subsequent evaluation. Dr. Pendergrass thought some new blood would be desirable. Will Thompson agreed he would offer help but that it would also be constructive to have some new evaluators in the team, and that the Council might indicate potential evaluators that might be available. Frank Parker said that the Technical Assistance Bureau was negotiating with MUCIA for an institution building grant. This organization might have institution building talent that could be tapped.

4. 211(d).

Dean Bentley noted that our discussion with AID indicated that proposals for extension and new funding are premature. He wondered if we could think about supplementary grants. Dr. Blume said that Erven Long would try to get a policy decision on new funding for this year. He indicated that the Council Universities could submit their proposals for extending the time of their grants or increasing the amounts. He noted that each one would be judged on its own merits, there would be no blanket awards giving equal treatment to the six. He said that each university could submit an additional proposal if it so desired. Dean Kiehl noted that Missouri was trying to think of ways of stretching the 211(d) money, including bringing in other sources of funds to pick up part of the time of students and professors under the program. Russell Larson felt that this would be a confusing situation. Mr. Bauman said that we should not overlook the possibility that the Mission could get the Indians convinced of the value to them of the 211(d) effort and that eventually some rupees might come into the program. Bentley wanted to know if the Council could develop a grant proposal including rupees under Section 211(d). Bauman said this was not possible.

There was discussion as to the desirability of notifying the Mission of the travel and study plans of 211(d) professors and students. Dr. Hixson favored being advised on these matters whereas Mr. Bauman felt that notifying AID/W was sufficient. The concensus of the Council appeared to be that notification to AID/W should be sufficient. Dean Kottman said that we need to negotiate a satisfactory understanding with the Indians for the management of 211(d). Dr. Mervin Smith wanted to know if any new 211(d) projects would have to be in India. We were informed by Dr. Blume that they would not have to be. The Director was asked to write Erven Long to: (1) Express our interest in continuation of 211(d) work, (2) Note benefits being achieved, and (3) Indicate interest in expansion of the program. The letter should also convey the need for effort on the part of the Mission to improve the climate for 211(d) work in India.

With respect to the suggestions of some 211(d) Professors that the program should be externally evaluated, the Council decided that the regular annual review was sufficient evaluation at this stage.

The need to consider the eventual placement of the 211(d) students was discussed. This was considered to be an institutional problem, but it was felt that the Council could help in publicizing the projected output of students. With respect to the recommendation of the 211(d) Professors that AID make greater use of the departments that are in the programs, Mr. Blume indicated that AID/W would try to keep the 211(d) Professors in mind in connection with participation in Spring Reviews and similar activities of mutual interest, and that it should be possible to work out some summer time or other kinds of work experiences in Washington for some of the 211(d) students.

5. Policy on visits between India and the U. S. personnel.

The various kinds of visits to India were discussed, including executive visits, professional visits, visits of the Chiefs of Party to his home campus, and the possibility of a Council meeting in India. Mr. Bauman and Dr. Blume reminded us of the allergy of the Mission to increased numbers of visits. Dean Larson felt that in general it was not necessary to make arbitrary provision for visits. It should be put on a justification basis. The Council did not feel it was necessary to reach any policy decision with respect to visits of campus coordinators to India or of Chiefs of Party to the home campus.

Dr. Renne said that the next meeting of the Indian Association of Agricultural Universities would be at Pantnagar from Thursday to Sunday, February 25 to 28, 1971. The Council members will receive an invitation to attend and participate. He felt that Saturday, February 27 would be a good day for a joint meeting with the Vice-Chancellors. Dean Bentley suggested that the

Council should respond positively to any invitation from the Vice-Chancellors to attend their meeting. It was agreed that the Council members would undertake to have a meeting at the February Conference in Pantnagar and to either be there or have an appropriate representative in their stead. It was agreed that this would constitute the executive visitors conference. Council members would plan to meet in Delhi either just before or after the meeting in Pantnagar.

Both Dr. Parker Rodgers and Dr. Ray Olson felt that there was insufficient provision in the contracts for executive visitors and professional visitors. They cited the need for some department chairmen to go to India in order to better understand the problems of our participant training and staff recruitment. The Council took no action on the number of executive visits needed.

6. Agricultural Production Program.

Mr. Bauman said that GOI plans to follow up the Sloan-Davis evaluation with another evaluation. The program was well received in India, but there was a feeling that is should not go too long in any one state. The Mission would like to see the program run three full tours running in any given state in contrast with the present two extended tours running five years. He said that the program would be ready to phase out at the end of the contract period in Orissa, Maharashtra, and APAU. New projects have been contemplated in West Bengal, Assam, and Kerala. Dr. Pendergrass stressed the need to plan continuity of the program in phase-out states through the AUD program.

7. Indian Agricultural Fund.

Mr. Joseph Platt, a Columbus attorney, presented to the Council some thoughts on the legal problems of establishing a foundation. He noted the advantages of avoiding becoming a private charitable foundation and cautioned that a foundation would need to avoid having funds earmarked to be spent abroad in order to conform with Treasury requirements. He presented the particulars of management fees charged by a large Columbus bank, the Huntington Bank. These fees run in total to about 9 or 10 percent of the income. He said that any bank we dealt with should have a correspondent in India. It would be well for advisors or trustees to be tied to the universities, although some outsiders could be included. Frank Parker stressed the importance of getting a grant of rupees for a foundation. He mentioned recent conversations with James Grant, of the Overseas Development Council, and said he would make arrangements for the Executive Director and himself to explore rupee and other fund problems in Washington soon.

Dr. Pendergrass asked Dean Kottman and Mervin Smith to continue their efforts to help in developing the proposal for a foundation. He also conveyed the appreciation of the Council to Mr. Platt for his cooperation.

8. The Basic Sciences and Humanities Position Paper.

In discussing this paper, Dean Larson questioned the advisibility of allowing Arts and Sciences to develop extensively, including provisions for granting degrees. Dean Kottman thought that degrees were not necessary to strength in the fields if the departments were well supported otherwise. Dr. Pendergrass thought that it might be advisable to keep some basic science people in the agricultural departments. Dr. Sutton noted that there are some specific recommendations on policies for Arts and Sciences in the PAU Evaluation Study. Dean Kottman moved that the Council decide what to do with the Basic Sciences and Humanities paper in November. Meanwhile, members should study it in conjunction with relevant portions of the PAU evaluation. Seconded by Vice-President Smith and carried. Dr. Pendergrass asked that in the interim, Council members send their comments to the Executive Director for collation and circulation.

9. New Business.

a. Dr. Mervin Smith reported that the Campus Operations Committee had discussed the desirability of having Mr. Chapman of OSU undertake an inter-university assignment of 2 years in the field of communications. He observed that the OWP provides for a centrally provided position as communications advisor. In any event, Mr. Chapman will be going back to PAU this winter for two to three months. Council members expressed no immediate need for the shared services of Mr. Chapman. Dr. Renne and Dr. Thorpe thought there eventually would be need for such a position.

b. The Council approved a request from USAID/Delhi that the Executive Director participate in the Agriculture Technician Conference in India in September.

c. Next Annual Joint Meeting of Council and COC.

Dean Kiehl invited the Council to meet at Columbia, Missouri in mid-July of 1971. Dean Bentley moved that the meeting be held in Columbia, seconded by Dean Larson and unanimously carried. The meeting is to be held immediately following the meeting of the North Central Directors. Dean Kiehl will advise the Executive Director of the suitable dates for the Council meeting.

d. It was agreed that the next regular meeting of the Council would be at the time of the NASULGC meetings which are to be in Washington from November 8 to 12. The meeting, as usual, will be a breakfast meeting.

e. Dean Larson submitted the following resolutions, which were seconded by Vice-President Smith and carried unanimously:

Whereas, Dean Roy Kottman and Assistant Dean Mervin Smith have rendered exceptional services to the CUSURDI in preparation for the annual meeting of the Council and its Campus Operations Committee, and cooperating agencies and guests, and have been our gracious hosts for this meeting -- Be it resolved that the CUSURDI and its Campus Operations Committee express sincere appreciation for all assistance and courtesies extended.

Whereas, the conference and housing facilities of the "Center for Tomorrow" have been complimentary to the purpose of the meeting and considerate of the comfort of the participants -- Be it resolved that CUSURDI and its Campus Operations Committee express their thanks and appreciation to the management of the "Center for Tomorrow" for the excellent accommodations and friendly high quality service.

f. Dean Kottman asked that the minutes show that the Council expressed its appreciation to Dean Bentley for his effective leadership as Chairman of the Council. Seconded by Dean Larson and unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Orlin J. Scoville, Executive Director CUSURDI.

MINUTES of CAMPUS OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

The Campus Operations Committee was convened in the Center for Tomorrow at 12:30 by Chairman Mervin Smith.

1. Orientation John Young noted that two weeks orientation in Washington had been added to the contracts. He also noted that expenses could not be paid for dependents at the orientation. James Blume said that complaints about the orientation should come to Erven Long who is on the University Relations Committee.

2. New Forms John Young noted that new biodata forms would be forthcoming. Theodore Wilson, Participant Branch said there would be new forms on per diem, illnesses, etc.

3. Overseas Personnel Lists The Campus Coordinators agreed to provide the Executive Director with these lists for the proceedings.

4. Next Meeting The COC agreed to meet in Washington in September.

APPENDIX A. CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Agency for International Development	
Oliver Bauman	Delhi, India
James M. Blume	Washington, D.C.
Gordon Evans	Delhi, India
Ephraim Hixson	Delhi, India
Frank W. Parker	Washington, D.C.
Ervin L. Peterson	Washington, D.C.
Theodore J. Wilson	Washington, D.C.
John Young	Washington, D.C.
Campus Operation's Committee and Related Personnel	
William G. Amstein	Kansas State University
W. D. Buddemeier	University of Illinois
Lewis H. Dickson	University of Tennessee
Robert W. Jugenheimer	University of Illinois
Robert H. McAlexander	Pennsylvania State University
Thomas A. McCowen	University of Illinois
Ray Olson	Kansas State University
John L. Parson	Ohio State University
J. Parker Rodgers	University of Missouri
Mervin G. Smith	Ohio State University
Council of U. S. Universities for Rural Development in India - Council and Alternates.	
Orville G. Bentley, Chm.	University of Illinois
Elmer R. Kiehl	University of Missouri
Roy M. Kottman	Ohio State University
Russell E. Larson	Pennsylvania State University
Webster Pendergrass, V. Chm.	University of Tennessee
O. J. Scoville, Exec. Dir.	Kansas State University
Floyd W. Smith	Kansas State University
NASULGC	
Paul Shaffer	Washington, D.C.
Others	
George Axinn	Midwest Universities A Consortium for International Activities, Inc.
H. J. Barre	Ohio State University
Harold Bauman	Ohio State University
Iqbal S. Bhatia	Punjab, India
David Boyne	Ohio State University
James Chapman	Ohio State University
Bruce Curry	OARDC, Wooster
Ruth Deacon	Ohio State University
Ira Deep	Ohio State University
Lester Gilmore	OARDC, Wooster
George Gist	Ohio State University
Ira A. Gould	Ohio State University
George Johnson	Ohio State University

Others (continued)	
Ted Jones	OARDC, Wooster
C. A. Lamb	Ohio State University
Francille Maloch	Ohio State University
Orlo Musgrave	Ohio State University
R. M. Porter	Ohio State University
R.R. Renne	University of Illinois
Austin Ritchie	Ohio State University
D. B. Robinson	Ohio State University
Berlie L. Schmidt	OARDC, Wooster
Glenn Schwab	Ohio State University
D. Alex Severino	Ohio State University
Osborn Smallwood	Ohio State University
T. S. Sutton	Ohio State University
George Taylor	Ohio State University
W. N. Thompson	University of Illinois
D. M. Thorpe	University of Tennessee
A. R. Winter	Ohio State University
Wilbur Wood	Ohio State University
Clyde Allison	Ohio State University
Alma Tapscott	Ohio State University
William Wayt	Ohio State University
Ralph Cummings	North Carolina State University
Robert W. Teater	Ohio State University
Dr. Sharma	University of Udaipur

APPENDIX B STAFF OF CUSURDI INSTITUTIONS ON THE INDIA PROGRAM
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS - (AID/NESA CONTRACTS 149 & 150)
U.S.A. Campus Personnel

R. W. Jugenheimer, Director (66%)
Office of Overseas Projects
University of Illinois
Room 352, 409 E. Chalmers
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Thomas A. McCowen, Associate Director
Office of Overseas Projects (66%)
University of Illinois
Room 352, 409 E. Chalmers
Champaign, Illinois 61820

W. D. Buddemeier, Director (50%)
International Agricultural Programs
University of Illinois
113 Mumford Hall
Urbana, Illinois 61801

E. R. Leng, Project Director (50%)
PIRIDS
University of Illinois
113 Mumford Hall
Urbana, Illinois 61801

B. L. Brooks, Research Supervisor (25%)
Agricultural Economics
University of Illinois
305 Mumford Hall
Urbana, Illinois 61801

****

J. Nehru Agricultural University
Address: J. Nehru Agricultural Univ.
Jabalpur, M. P.
India
Vice Chancellor - L. S. Negi

University of Illinois (Field)

Morell B. Russell, Chief of Party
Agricultural Administration

John H. Behrens
Communications

John H. Byers
Animal Science (Production)

Carl N. Hittle*
Agronomy

Donald J. Minehart
Research Farms

Sheldon W. Williams*
Agricultural Economics

W. A. Meyer
Graduate Student
Plant Pathology

Matthias K. von Oppen
Graduate Student
Agricultural Economics

Uttar Pradesh Agricultural University
Address: U.P. Agricultural University
P.O. Pant Nagar, Dist. Nainital
U.P., India
Vice Chancellor - D. P. Singh

University of Illinois (Field)

Roland R. Renne, Chief of Party
Post Graduate and Curriculum Devel.

Carl S. Bittner
Horticulture

Jeannette B. Dean
Home Science

Joe R. Gingrich
Soil Science

Richard M. Matsuura*
Agronomy

Emmett E. Ormiston
Dairy Science

Errol D. Rodda
Agricultural Engineering

Marlowe D. Thorne
Water Technology

Richard A. Sikora
Graduate Student
Plant Pathology

*CRP (Coordinated Research Project/Soybeans)

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY (Field - AID/nesa Contracts 146 and 322)

Address: Andhra Pradesh Agricultural University
"Dilkusha" - Raj Bhavan Road
Hyderabad-4, A. P., India

Vernon C. Larson
Chief of Party

Paul E. Johnson
Dairy Manufacturing Advisor

Ernest L. Mader (Tirupati)
Soil Conservation Advisor

Roger C. Medlin
Agricultural Information Advisor

H. James Miller
Campus Planner - (Delhi)

Robert J. Raney
Irrigation Advisor

John K. Winkler
Veterinary Advisor

APP Program - Andhra Pradesh

Address: Andhra Pradesh Agricultural University
"Dilkusha" - Raj Bhavan Road
Hyderabad-4, A. P., India

Larry S. Axthelm
Water Use Management &
Drainage Advisor

Elbert L. Eshbaugh
Plant Protection Advisor

D. Dean Dicken
Soil Fertility Advisor

Layle D. Lawrence
Agricultural Implements
Advisor and Team Leader

John M. Hamon
Seed Production Advisor

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

October 16, 1970

Orissa

Agricultural University Development - AID/nesa 144

Harold V. Walton	Chief of Party	U.S. AID/India Program c/o Orissa University of Agriculture and Technology Bhubaneswar 3, Orissa, India
Walter Wilkening	Extension Education	same
Clifton Murphy	Veterinary	same

Orissa

Agricultural Production Program - AID/nesa 320

Frank Miller	Seeds Team Leader	same
Roger C. Hanson	Soil Fertility and Water Management	same
Ed. J. Constien	Farm Implements	same
Wm. K. Delaplane	Plant Protection	same
Bruce O. Coles	Farm Management	same

Bihar

Agricultural Production Program - AID/nesa 321

C. R. Meeker	Chief of Party Extension Information	141 Pataliputra Colony Patna 13, Bihar, India
Ted S. Brook	Plant Protection	21 Pataliputra Colony Patna 13, Bihar, India
Charles F. Cromwell, Jr.	Water Use and Management	185 Pataliputra Colony Patna 13, Bihar, India

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY - AID/nesa 147
The Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, Punjab
and
The Haryana Agricultural University, Hissar, Haryana

Field Personnel

Cecil A. Lamb, Chief of Party and Nuclear Seed Production Ludhiana - PAU	Started April 1968 Present tour - 1 year Terminate August 1971
John W. Hibbs, Animal Science, Nutrition and Physiology Hissar - HAU	Started October 1969 For 2 years Terminate October 1971
Raymond A. Bailey, Agricultural Economics, Agricultural Credit Ludhiana - PAU	6 months Nominated to arrive October 1, 1970

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY - AID/nesa 148
The University of Udaipur
Udaipur, Rajasthan

Field Personnel

Ira A. Gould, Chief of Party and Agricultural Education Udaipur	Starting August 1970 for 2 years Terminate August 1972
Ralph D. Barner, Veterinary and Animal Science Bikaner	Started June 1965 Present tour - 1 year Terminate November 1970
Fanchon Warfield, Home Economics Udaipur	Started August 1964 Present tour - 1 year Terminate August 1970
Lawrence A. Best, Extension Education Udaipur	Started October 1967 Present tour - 1 year Terminate February 1971
Leland A. Drew, Agricultural Engineering Udaipur	Started February 1968 Present tour - 1 year Terminate June 1971

No Nominations at Present

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY - (AID/nesa Contracts 295 and 346)

U. S. A. Campus Personnel

Robert H. McAlexander, Coordinator
International Agricultural Programs
206 Armsby Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

****

MAHARASHTRA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY

Address: The Mahatma Phule Agricultural University
College of Agriculture Compound
Poona 5, India

Vice Chancellor - Padma Shree H. G. Patil

U. S. Personnel

Address: The Pennsylvania State University USAID-AUD Team
Central Building Annexe
Box 16, General Post Office
Poona 1, Maharashtra, India

The Pennsylvania State University (Field)

Robert E. Swope
Agricultural Education Advisor
and Chief of Party

W. Homer Cloninger
Dairy Genetics Advisor*

Frank J. McArdle
Agricultural Technology Advisor

APP PROGRAM - MAHARASHTRA

Address: The Pennsylvania State University USAID/APP Team
Central Building Annexe
Box 72, General Post Office
Poona 1, Maharashtra, India

Mark D. Shaw
Agricultural Engineering
Advisor & Chief of Party

Carlton F. Taylor
Plant Protection Advisor

Thomas Webb**
Agronomy & Seed Improvement
Advisor

Roger Pennock, Jr.
Soil and Water Management
Advisor

*Deceased
**Nominated

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

U.S.A. Campus Personnel

Dr. Webster Pendergrass
Vice President
Institute of Agriculture

Lewis H. Dickson
Director
International Agricultural Progs.

Contract AID/nesa - 145 - Mysore University of Agricultural Sciences

Address: Mysore University of Agricultural Sciences
Hebal, Bangalore 24, India

D. M. Thorpe
Chief of Party

L. C. Parker
Animal Production Advisor

Oddest H. Long
Soil Science Advisor

Estel H. Hudson
Agricultural Economics Advisor

M. Gist Welling
Agricultural Extension Advisor

*W. L. Parks
Agronomy Consultant

D. M. Seath
Agricultural Research Advisor

*(Expected to leave for India January 1971)

Contract AID/nesa - 318 - APP Program - Mysore

Address: Department of Agriculture
Seshadri Road
Bangalore 1, India

T. R. Langford
Farmers Training & Education
Advisor & Team Leader

Gilbert R. Muhr
Soil Testing & Fertilizer
Use Advisor

F. W. Bennett
Farm Implements Advisor

*L. M. Josephson
Seed Production & Processing
Consultant

E. A. Heinrichs
Plant Protection Advisor

*(Expected to leave for India January 1971)

A. C. Blake
Agricultural Information Advisor

Contract AID/nesa - 319 - APP Program - Madras

Address: Agricultural College & Research Institute
Lawley Road P. O.
Coimbatore 3, India

L. D. Haws
Plant Protection Advisor
& Team Leader

*Earl Moncur
Agricultural Extension Advisor

Joe B. Richardson
Agricultural Implements Advisor

*E. Don Hansen
Water Use & Management Advisor

*M. L. Kumler
Agronomy Advisor

*(Awaiting official approval of nomination.)

APPENDIX C TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY Development - A Re-examination

Russell O. Olson
Assistant Director, USAID, India

USAID has been providing technical assistance to India for the improvement of agricultural education, research and extension since 1955. This assistance has been provided through contracts with several American Land Grant Universities. Since 1963 the program has focused on assistance to specific state agricultural universities, created to integrate the functions of teaching research and extension education on a state-wide basis.

The GOI has indicated that eventually each Indian State may have such an agricultural university and it is expected that the Central Government, through ICAR, will support such expansion. It is expected that USAID will be requested to provide technical assistance to some or all of these new agricultural universities. Meanwhile, assistance to the universities now being aided will need to continue for some time.

The purpose of this note is to re-examine our program of assistance to see what changes in approach and content are appropriate in order to: (1) improve the effectiveness of assistance to the agricultural universities already established, and (2) be able to respond constructively to requests for assistance to new universities.

The current arrangement, under which USAID contracts with an American University to provide assistance to a particular Indian agricultural university, has some very desirable features. In the first place, most of the technically competent people needed for staffing the program are in the Universities. AID would find it extremely difficult to recruit the needed staff except through contracts with Universities. But, aside from the recruitment problem, an important consideration has been the value that a "sisterhood" relationship between the American institution and the host Indian University presumably would have, over the years, in promoting the growth and development of the Agricultural University. Staff members of the American university would come to have considerable knowledge of the problems and needs of the assisted Indian university. This knowledge would be gained by the direct experiences of staff members serving on the technical assistance teams in India and through close contact with staff members of the Indian university doing graduate studies in the USA under the participant training program.

It has been assumed that an intimacy would develop that would lead to a continuing exchange of personnel and communication of ideas beyond the terms of our formal USAID assistance programs. It is apparent that this arrangement has generally worked well in establishing useful and lasting links.

The "new approach", developed jointly by the Assicoation of Land Grant Universities and the Agency for International Development, strongly endorses the concept of a close relationship between the American university and an agricultural university in a developing country and urges that both institutions exercise more autonomy (less intervention by AID/W and USAID as well as by the host government) in planning and implementing the assistance program. The report lays out a guide to orderly and effective development, based on experience in institution building over a number of years and in many countries.

Our experience, however, suggests that while a direct, intimate institution to institution arrangement can foster communication that is useful in strengthening the development of good university programs, this arrangement has serious limitations, which require that we explore alternative or supplementary arrangements to improve the effectiveness of the assistance program.

The "sisterhood" relationship may not be particularly appropriate for meeting the needs for more specialized assistance required by the more developed institutions, where emphasis will be on development of special areas of importance for post graduate training and research. A particular agricultural university may wish to develop as a center of excellence in an area of study such as Food Technology, Water Management, or Citrus Production, as examples. The American sister institution, in many cases, will be in a poor position to promote help in that area from its staff, as it may be a relatively unimportant subject area in its state. Recruitment for technician posts for such development would more appropriately be from the American Universities with the best staff and facilities in that field of study.

The sisterhood arrangement has a more serious limitation in affecting the more important organizational and policy decisions -- those made at the level of the vice chancellor, the board of management, or the state government. This is not a criticism of the efforts of the contract university teams. The limitation is inherent in the arrangement. A contract chief of party, as leader of the American university team, has been expected to develop close working relations with the vice chancellor and, hopefully, he would be privy to the development plans for the university, and would be solicited for advise on development plans and policies. However, he is normally assigned against a requested position as advisor to staff at an echelon below the vice chancellor level -- such as advisor to the director of research or to the dean or even department head. His success in maintaining effective working relationships at that level is often jeopardized by any attempts to influence decisions at higher levels. The opportunities open to him to work with officials at higher levels depends very much on the receptiveness and responsiveness of officials at the higher levels -- and this, in turn, depends also on the credentials the chief of party can present. The vice chancellors are, almost without exception, very senior, experienced officials. They can not be expected to take easily advice from someone who has not had impressive experience in university administration. But, even so, where the vice chancellor recognizes the competence of a chief of party to advise on important university policy matters and is receptive to his advice, there are

difficulties in communicating with boards of management and with the state governments -- and it is often here where the crucial decisions affecting the universities development are made.

What then, can be done to overcome these weaknesses? We might consider putting more emphasis on strengthening the advisory capacity at the Center. A small team of senior, highly respected Indian officials who have had experience in agricultural university administration, research organization or curriculum development could, it seems, be very effective in advising the states on legislation and top level organization and policy matters.

If such a central team is developed, which might logically be located in or sponsored by the Association of Agricultural Universities but funded by ICAR, USAID might provide technical assistance to this team, either on a full or part time basis. The number of American experts required would be small, but it is essential that they be outstanding individuals, with recognized experience and reputations in agricultural education. The American experts might include for example, an ex-president of a university, a former dean of agriculture, a dean of graduate studies, a director of research and a director of extension.

The recent evaluation exercise undertaken by a joint team of Indian and American educators for the Punjab Agricultural University, produced a report which should be extremely useful to the vice chancellor and the State Government in improving the functioning of that University. That team also developed a methodology that could be used effectively in assessing development needs at other universities and advising top level decision makers of needed changes. The ad-hoc activity is suggestive of what might be done in organizing a unit with joint Indo-American participation at the Center. However, it might be more appropriate if the GOI were to organize a permanent central advisory team.

The American advisors to the central unit should help develop policy guidelines for the agricultural universities on problem areas within their special competencies. For example, a common problem in all the agricultural universities is how to develop the extension education function of the university to work effectively and harmoniously with the State Department of Agriculture and its field staffs. The advisors with experience in Extension Administration should be useful in helping solve these problems. The advisor with experience as a university president should be helpful in developing programs for improving the functioning of boards of management and overall university policy determination.

During the past year USAID has had a very favorable experience in using a centrally posted expert in campus planning to serve the various state agricultural universities. This arrangement has made it possible to schedule the expert's time efficiently, to work at each of the universities as and when there were opportunities for productive work. During each visit he had been able to enumerate the steps that need to be taken by the university before his next visit will be useful and return only when these steps have been taken, meanwhile responding to opportunities

at other institutions. This pattern of operation seems very well suited for members of the proposed central team of university advisory suggested above. It would also be an appropriate arrangement for certain types of specialists in such area as library management or student counseling as proposed at the meeting of the CUSURDI in July 1968. But here, in this note, the concern is primarily with improving effectiveness of the program in influencing top level policies and decisions affecting the development of the universities.

The idea of a strong central advisory unit is also relevant to the initiation of assistance to new or proposed agricultural universities, of which there will be perhaps five or six in the next few years. The "new approach" proposed in the AID - Land Grant University report, outlines a logical phasing of the development of a program of assistance to new agricultural universities in which the assisting American University plays a very prominent role in the initial stages of developing a plan for assistance. In India it might be appropriate to give that responsibility to the proposed central advisory unit. USAID should offer assistance to the Center Unit, either through permanently assigned advisors on our Delhi staff or by bringing in short term consultants particularly qualified to assist in initial planning. This is, perhaps, one way in which USAID can respond constructively to requests to assist new agricultural universities. It would not involve or imply commitments to any American University to enter into a long term contract for assistance to the institution. It would not, of course, involve any long term commitment of USAID assistance to the institution, though it should be expected that as the new university develops and opportunities to useful assistance in the field becomes apparent we will want to consider assigning experts to the institution, probably under a university contract. The important advantage of this approach is not only the greater flexibility it provides USAID in moving into an assistance program but, more importantly, the central team, if properly constituted and adequately supported by ICAR and USAID, can be more effective than can a U. S. university team in influencing the legislation, ordinances and other elements of organization and policy decided at the state level, which are crucial to satisfactory development of a university.

This proposal for strengthening the advisory capacity at the Center should not be viewed as an effort to weaken the institution to institution relationship between the American and Indian universities. On the contrary, the aim is to relieve the American university of responsibility for influencing action by the vice chancellor, boards of management and state Governments. It recognizes that the American University teams are normally put in an awkward position in attempting to influence decisions at those levels directly. By placing responsibility for improving organization and performance at that level on the central unit, the University contract team can concentrate on giving technical assistance in their area of specialty. The University contract arrangement will still be the appropriate way to provide assistance for development of departments, and specialties within the departments. The "sisterhood" relationship should remain intact, supported by the exchange of faculty, and the participant training program.